

THE CONTRIBUTION OF HERMANN CREMER (1834-1903)
TO THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS

By

Robert C. Duncan

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of Divinity,
New College, University of Edinburgh, in
Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

October 1957

(June, 1958.)



CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iv

PART I.

SEMANTICS AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Chapter		
I.	CREMER'S <u>BIBLISCH THEOLOGISCHES WOERTERBUCH</u>	2
	Origins	
	Antecedents	
	Aims	
	Results	
II.	BASIC FACTORS IN THE FORMATION OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS	47
	The Hebraic Background	
	The Decisive Content: Jesus Christ	
	The Hellenistic Environment	
III.	SOME COMPARISONS BETWEEN CREMER'S WOERTERBUCH AND KITTEL'S <u>THEOLOGISCHES WOERTERBUCH ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT</u>	88
	The Relation between Cremer and Kittel	
	The Word of God	
	Holiness	
	The Kingdom of God	
	Evaluation	

PART II.

SEMANTICS AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

IV.	AN APPROACH TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY	119
	The <u>Woerterbuch</u> as Biblical Theology	
	Redemptive History	
	Images and Types	
V.	BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AS "HEILSGESCHICHTE"	136
	The Origins of the "Redemptive History" School	
	Israel's History as Redemptive History	
	Promise and Fulfilment	
	Miracles	
	Angels and Supernatural Powers	
	The Last Things	

VI. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION 163

Righteousness and Justification in The Woerterbuch
Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre
 Evaluation

PART III
 APPROPRIATION

VII. THE APPROPRIATION OF CREMER'S LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES 201
IN HIS DOGMATICS

Dogmatic Principles and Method
 The Attributes of God
 The Authority and Inspiration of Scripture
 Reconciliation and Redemption

VIII. AN INTEGRATED THEOLOGICAL METHOD 223

Cremer's Sermons
 A Critical Problem
 Christ pro nobis
 Semantics, Biblical Theology, and Church Proclamation

IX. THE PLACE OF SEMANTICS IN THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS . . 235

A Summary of the Basic Insights
 Graeco-Roman Culture and Biblical Interpretation
 A Method for Biblical Theology
 The Word and the Spirit: Continuing Results

ABBREVIATIONS 246

BIBLIOGRAPHY 247

PREFACE

During the last century and a half the Holy Scriptures have been subjected to an immense amount of painstaking scientific research. A vast body of new knowledge has come to light as a result, and the historico-critical method reigns supreme in the realm of biblical interpretation. Archaeology, the history of religions, textual, literary, and form criticism, all played a part in the movement toward a more scientific understanding of the biblical writings. Yet for some time past there has been a growing feeling in many quarters that all this is not enough. Hermeneutics has become a fashionable word once more in the theological vocabulary.

The theological revival which is spreading through the churches has brought with it a renewed concern to discover the biblical basis for the unity of the Church. Biblical studies are tending to delve more and more into the meaning of the theological terminology of Scripture itself. There is every indication that some of the deepest problems of biblical theology can be resolved by means of a semantic investigation of key words in both the Old and New Testaments. It is in this connection that the labors of the German theologian Hermann Cremer (1834-1903) take on fresh interest and significance. I shall endeavor to show how his theological studies of the language of the New Testament helped prepare the way for Gerhard Kittel's monumental Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. When one speaks of the part which Cremer has played in developing a better method for biblical

theology, he needs also to mention the names of August Tholuck, Martin Kaehler, and Adolf Schlatter.

Tholuck is remarkable in that he anticipated many of the theological developments of our own era. He stressed the theological value of the Old Testament at a time when it was being generally depreciated. He had a keen appreciation for the exegetical skill of the Reformers and sought to make their writings more widely-known. Calvin's New Testament commentaries were republished with Tholuck as editor. Tholuck's theology had an emancipating effect on a whole generation of German theological students, and his influence extended to America and Britain. The effect was comparable in some respects to that produced in this century by Karl Barth's critique of liberal Protestantism. Tholuck, too, was the author of a commentary on Romans which was the signal for a new movement. Tholuck's connections with Pietism are well-known, yet few realize that he was a Church theologian as well. The relation between Tholuck and Cremer was that of teacher and pupil, and it is Tholuck's influence upon Cremer in his formative years that merits our chief consideration.

Cremer and his friends Kaehler and Schlatter do not form "a school" in the strictest sense. Each was an individualist. They differed in background, temperament, and outlook. Cremer and Kaehler were Lutheran; Schlatter was Reformed. But they had this in common; they were all biblical theologians. They combined confidence in the biblical witness with thoroughgoing historical research. This was the distinctive and significant feature of their hermeneutics. They understood theology to be

a scientific discipline. Because they differed from one another, these three scholars could work in a reciprocal, complementary relationship which provided mutual correction and encouragement. Their collaboration ultimately found expression in the periodical Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie. In their opposition to liberalism they were not combatting the historico-critical method but a one-sided emphasis on this method, a tendency for autonomous man to set himself up as judge over Scripture. This was what kept Cremer and his associates apart from the exegesis of F.C. Baur, from the idea of evolution as a hermeneutical canon, from the Ritschlian theology, and from Harnack with his "essence of Christianity". Thus they stood aloof from all the major theological movements of the latter half of the nineteenth century. By refusing to be liberals they did not thereby fall back into a historical rationalism or a biblicist fundamentalism. Rather, they are forerunners of that biblical theology which has been characteristic of the theological reawakening in Europe since World War I and in America since World War II.

I have not attempted to write a full biography of Cremer, nor do I feel obliged to assess his theological position in relation to his famous contemporaries, nor am I interested in his role in German church politics. These matters have been adequately dealt with elsewhere. My chief concern is with his Biblisches-theologisches Woerterbuch, for therein lies the heart of his theology, and in it, too, is to be found the key to his method of interpreting Scripture.

The writer owes the initial idea upon which this dissertation is based to the Rev. Professor T. F. Torrance who also shared some inspiring insights with him in the course of its preparation. He is

grateful for the valuable comments and criticisms made by the Rev. Professor N.W. Porteous who read the manuscript with great care. While searching for material he became indebted to a number of people; notably to Professor Karl Gerhard Steck of the University of Frankfurt who loaned him several volumes from his personal library, as did also Professor Peter Brunner of the University of Heidelberg. The resources of the Vereinigte Theologisches Seminar and the Niedersaechsischen Staats-und Universitaets Bibliothek in Goettingen were available, and this proved to be an indispensable help. The staff of the library at the University of Edinburgh secured some hard-to-locate works of Cremer. Dr. J. A. Lamb and Miss Erna Leslie in the New College Library were a never-failing source of information and encouragement. Finally, the writer wishes to thank Miss Elspeth Pope, who typed the manuscript.

Portland, Oregon.
September 20, 1957.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

CREMER'S BIBLISCH-THEOLOGISCHES WOERTERBUCH

Origins

August Hermann Cremer was born on the 18th of October 1834 in the village of Unna, Westphalia, Germany.¹ His father, Wilhelm Cremer, was a schoolteacher; and his mother, Luise, was the daughter of a Jewish merchant, Simon Josephson, who, in 1805, had become a Christian along with his whole family. The home atmosphere in which Hermann grew up was simple and devout. He was the only boy in a family of six girls. As a heritage from his parental home he took with him into life "a bent for hard work and the recollection of the quiet peace of genuine piety".² After a brief period at the Gymnasium in Dortmund, he was sent to the one in Guetersloh. Here his incentive to learn increased, and, amid Christian influences, he felt more at home than he had done in the "rationalistic" atmosphere of the Dortmund Gymnasium.

Cremer's interest in biblical studies began early. During his school holidays he came in contact with the Pietist Bible study groups which had been founded more than half a century earlier by the Barmen physician and lay-theologian, Dr. Samuel Collenbusch.³ He became such an ardent Bible student that his teachers were concerned lest he neglect his academic subjects. Their

1 The only full biography of Cremer is the one by his son, Ernst Cremer, Hermann Cremer, ein Lebens-und Charakterbild (Guetersloh, 1912).

2 Johannes Haussleiter in PRE XXIII, p. 329.

3 Martin Kaehler, Wie Hermann Cremer wurde? BFTh, VIII, 1 (1904), p. 14.

fears were unfounded, however, for he proved to be one of the best students¹ in his class. In the autumn of 1853 when Cremer went to the University of Halle to begin the study of theology, the foundations were already laid for² that biblicism which was to prove so important later.

It was Professor Tholuck of Halle who first gave Cremer the idea for a special lexicon of the New Testament. Years afterward, Cremer recalled that Tholuck's lectures on Romans in the winter semester 1854-55 had been of³ decisive significance for him. Tholuck was noted for the influence he exerted through personal contacts made with students outside the classroom. Once while on a walk he told Cremer that he ought to write a lexicon of New Testament concepts.⁴ The suggestion bore fruit. Tholuck's own commentaries provided a model for Cremer's research in its early stages. It was very fitting that Cremer should dedicate the first and second editions of his⁵ lexicon to Tholuck. But as Kaehler has rightly pointed out, Cremer was no

1 E. Cremer, op. cit., pp. 15-16

2 "Freilich wurzelt seine Entwicklung durchaus nicht in den kirchlichen und theologischen Schichten, die sich unter den ueberwiegenden Einfluss des grossen Ganges des Philosophie seit Kant gestaltet haben, vielmehr in der umfassenden Bewegung der neueren Erweckung und in ihren Anknuepfung an den aelteren Pietismus." Kaehler, op. cit., p. 17

3 Ibid., p. 16

4. E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 20. Cf. Viktor Schultze, "Rede bei der Gedaechnisfeier in der Aula der Universitaet Greifswald," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblaetter, (Guetersloh, 1904), p. 21; and Johannes Haussleiter, op. cit., p. 329.

5 "Mit Vielen, die es nie vergessen koennen, was Sie uns gewesen sind, moechte auch ich ein Zeichen der Liebe, der Verehrung und des Dankes Ihnen heute darbringen, -die Verehrung die, ich moechte sagen, mit mir aufgewachsen ist. Denn von fruehesten Jugend auf bin ich gewohnt, Ihren Namen in meinem Elternhaus - es ist kein Pfarrhaus - nur mit innigsten Ehrerbietung nennen zu hoeren. Ich habe nichts Anders als dieses Buch . . . Es traegt die Spuren Ihres Lebens, Ihres Zeugnisses an sich; es verdankt Ihrer Anregung auf einem

1
 slavish imitator of Tholuck. He was indebted to him for the initial stimulus, but in the carrying out of this difficult task he showed originality and resourcefulness. During his Halle period, Cremer took a course from Hupfeld on "The Structure of the Hebrew Language". Although he seldom attended the lectures, he received marks on his papers of "very industrious" and "excellent",
 2
 an indication of his growing interest in linguistics.

In 1856 when Cremer transferred to the University of Tuebingen, Ferdinand Christian Baur was still lecturing there, but his popularity had waned. Instead,
 3
 the students flocked to hear Oehler and Beck. During the summer semester 1856 and the winter semester 1856-57, Cremer heard lectures by Beck on Acts and Romans, and by Baur on the Apocalypse. Beck contributed little to the
 4
Woerterbuch, however much Cremer may owe to him in other respects. Cremer's lexicographical investigations only served to accentuate the points where he differed with Beck whose treatment of the central biblical concepts was unhistorical. Cremer found that he could not use Beck's exegesis and told him
 5
 so. While at Tuebingen Cremer met Martin Kaehler who was destined to become his life-long friend. Kaehler had also been at Halle, but they had not known

Spaziergänge im Jahre 1855 seine Entstehung. Es bezeugt auch seinerseits die Wirkung jenes ersten Schrittes zur Wiedergeburt der Exegese, den Sie mit Ihren Commentar zum Roemerbriefe vor beinahe fuenfzig Jahren in Gottes Namen thaten und der in der Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche unvergesslich bleiben wird." (From Cremer's dedication to Tholuck in the flyleaf of the second German edition of his lexicon).

1 Kaehler, op. cit., p. 17.

2 E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 21.

3 Kaehler, op. cit., p. 9.

4 "Unsere hervorragenden positiven Theologen wie Cremer und Kaehler sind, wenn sie auch nicht zu sein ausdrücklichen Schuelern zaehlen, doch in der mannigfachsten und nachhaltigen Weise von ihm angeregt und beeinflusst." A Sturhan, Zur systematischen Theologie Johannes Tobias Becks, BFTh, VII, 6 (1903), p. 5.

5 Kaehler, op. cit., p. 12.

each other there. In the spring of 1857 Cremer sat his theological examinations at Muenster and passed with high marks. About this time he made the acquaintance of Steinkopf, a publisher at Stuttgart. Steinkopf was very much interested in the proposed lexicon, and provided him with funds for a further period of study at Tuebingen.¹

In the summer of 1858 Cremer entered a dissertation, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Matth. 24. 25., in a University competition, but failed to win the prize because his views differed from those of his supervisor, Beck. Nevertheless, the work earned him the degree of Licentiate. It was published by Steinkopf in 1860.² The title suggests the eschatological interest which was occupying Cremer at this time. During the winter of 1858-59 he met every Saturday evening with Kaehler and another friend to study the Book of Revelation.³ Undoubtedly many of the insights for the interpretation of Revelation which are to be found in the Woerterbuch stem from those Saturday evening discussions. That same winter Cremer showed Kaehler a rough draft of his first lexicographical research. It was the article on κήρυξ, κηρύσσειν, κήρυγμα.⁴

Cremer wished to study for his doctorate in order to qualify for a

1 E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 27.

2 This was Cremer's first published book. Included in the detailed exposition are word-studies similar to those found in the Woerterbuch. See, for example: συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος pp. 21 f.; παρουσία, pp. 19 f.; ἀρχή, pp. 32-33, 35 f.; οἰκουμένη, p. 53; βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, pp. 58 ff; ἐκλεκτός, p. 83; δόξα pp. 193 ff.

3 Cremer later wrote to Kaehler: "Denkst du noch an vor zwei Jahren? an die Krone der Woche am Samstag?" Kaehler, op. cit., p. 10.

4 E. Cremer suggests that his father's choice of just these terms may have been due to an awareness that he must soon take up the duties of preaching and pastoral care. E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 28.

teaching position, but his dreams were shattered when the Church authorities in Westphalia refused to sponsor him for any further study. This temporary frustration of his plans proved to be providential; for without pastoral experience and a continuing association with the pastoral office, he would never have become what he later became. He was now obliged to look for a pastoral charge, and preached in a vacant church at Ostoennen, Westphalia, the last of seventeen candidates. To his utter amazement he received a telegram notifying him that he had been chosen. He later described this as the most difficult day of his life. After an inner struggle he accepted the call, and on the first Sunday in Advent 1859 he was ordained and installed as pastor. He served this congregation faithfully for eleven years. The relationship was altogether a happy one, and Cremer soon demonstrated his ability as a pastor and preacher.¹

Cremer's quiet country parish allowed him time to continue work on his lexicon. It soon proved to be a bigger task than he had thought at first. The publisher, Steinkopf, who had visualized a convenient handbook which could be ready in two years, lost patience with the enterprise. He felt that Grimm-Wilke's lexicon, which had appeared meantime, fulfilled the purpose for which Cremer's work was intended. He did not realise that Cremer's book was no² conventional lexicon. When his research was finally completed in the spring of

1 This is the account given by Schultze, op. cit., p. 330. The same information is also found in E. Cremer's biography. On 8th October 1862 Cremer married Maria Huelsmann, daughter of Bergwerksdirektor Huelsmann of Eschweiler, near Aachen.

2 E. Cremer, op. cit., pp. 64-65.

1866 Cremer had to look for another publisher. Eventually he persuaded the firm of Friedrich Andreas Perthes in Gotha to print the lexicon. The demand for the first edition exceeded all expectations; and Cremer was embarked on a career of editing, revising, and supplementing his material a task which was to occupy him for the remainder of his life. Soon after its publication the Woerterbuch was translated into English and Dutch.¹ Over a period of thirty-six years the book grew until it was twice its original size (1120 pages in the ninth edition). There were nine German editions in Cremer's lifetime² and two more after his death.³ The English translation has gone through four editions.⁴

The Woerterbuch brought Cremer's name into prominence in theological circles almost overnight. The invitation to join the faculty of the University of Greifswald came largely as a result of the reputation which the Woerterbuch earned for him. In 1873 the University of Berlin conferred upon him the degree

1 The Dutch translation is mentioned in the translator's preface to the fourth English edition.

2 Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecitaet. 1. Aufl. (Gotha, 1867); 2. Aufl. (1872); 3. Aufl. (1883); 4. Aufl. (1886); 5. Aufl. (1888); 6. Aufl. (1889); 7. Aufl. (1893); 8. Aufl. (1895); 9. Aufl. (1902).

3 Ibid., 10. Aufl., hrsg. Julius Koegel (Gotha, 1915). A fully revised edition with numerous alterations.

Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 11. Aufl. (1923). An unrevised reprint of the 10th edition.

4 Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, trans. D.W. Simon and W. Urwick (Edinburgh, 1872); 2nd ed., trans. W. Urwick (1878); 3rd ed. (1880); 3rd ed. with a supplement containing the new material from the 3rd and 4th German editions (1886); 4th ed. (1892). The 4th edition was reprinted in 1895. The demand for this book is evidently still very great. In 1954 T. & T. Clark issued a reprint of 1000 copies.

of Doctor of Divinity in recognition of his contribution to biblical scholarship.¹ In token of his gratitude, Cremer dedicated the third edition of his lexicon to the Berlin faculty.

Antecedents

Lexicography and the Biblical Text. --When one seeks to assign Cremer a place in the history of lexicography it becomes apparent that his true precursors are not classical philologists but interpreters of Holy Scripture. Lexicography had its earliest beginnings in the notations inserted in manuscripts by copyists as an aid to the reader. Ludwig Koehler has pointed out some explanatory notes of this kind in the text of the Old Testament. One writer records a change of usage in the Hebrew term for a prophet (I Sam. 9.9). Another gives the Hebrew equivalent for an Egyptian word, (Jer. 35.5), and another supplies a common synonym for a rare word (Is. 51.17, 22).² In the New Testament the writers of the Gospels gave Greek equivalents for some Aramaic expressions which would be unfamiliar to Gentile readers.³ In all these cases the aim was to supply additional information to clarify what otherwise might be incomprehensible to the reader.⁴ In Rabbinic Judaism the

1 E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 88.

2 Ludwig Koehler, Der hebraeische Mensch (Tuebingen, 1953), p. 1.

3 "Talitha cumi," Mark 5.41; "Corban," 7.11; "Ephphatha," 7.34; "Eloi, Eloi, . . ." 15.34; "Rabbi," John 1.38; "Messiah," 1.41; "Cephas," 1.42; "Golgotha," 19.17. Note the use of the verb ἐμμενῶ in the Greek text.

4 Such annotations may be theological as well as linguistic. For example, the LXX rendering of כִּפְרוּרָה by ἀλλοτρίσιον ἐπιθέματα (ex. 25.16 f.) is not an exact translation but a theological elaboration of the Hebrew word. Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. A. Grieve (Edinburgh, 1901), pp. 125 ff.

practice of accumulating interpretative data around the text went to extreme lengths, as evidenced by the Talmud and the Midrashim. By such a process, much that is worthless will be accumulated along with a little that is of real value.

Greek lexicography has its roots in compilations begun long before the Christian era, most of which have been lost. Of the remnants which have been preserved, nearly all are lexicons based on classical Greek.¹ Lexicographical notes on biblical Greek were made by the Greek Christian scholars of the Byzantine Period. Their methods were not unlike those of the Latin scholars of the Western Church:

The Greeks also wrote philological scholia in their copies, mostly extracts from older commentaries; we are accustomed to rank them higher than the others because they are not so useless to us. They also formed separate collections of them, in alphabetical order, and studied the secular writers for the same purpose; these then became the not altogether valueless beginnings of Greek lexicography.²

These Byzantine scholars, however, were burying the special features of the New Testament language under deep layers of Hellenistic thinking and Patristic tradition.

1 Philo of Alexandria may have been the author of a dictionary explaining the Hebrew names in the LXX. Such a work was known to Origen and Jerome. A papyrus fragment has been found which contains a list of names of this type. It is of Christian origin and dates from the third or fourth century A.D. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, trans. L. Strachan (London, 1910), p. 45.

The more important ancient Greek lexicographers whose works are still extant are: Aelius Moeris (c. 190 A.D.), Attic lexicon; Julius Pollus (2nd cent. A.D.), Onomasticon; Harpocration (2nd cent. A. D.), lexicon on the ten Attic orators. These contribute little to the theological interpretation of the New Testament, but Cremer found them useful in making comparisons.

2 Eduard Reuss, History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, trans. E.L. Houghton (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 552. In this group belong: Hesychius of Alexandria (5th cent.); Suidas (10th cent.?); Zonaras (12th cent.).

A similar development may be seen in the medieval glosses on the text of the Vulgate.¹ In the course of centuries these Latin glosses grew to such enormous proportions that they had to be separated from the text and reassembled in lexicons, grammars, and commentaries. This shows how closely the lexicon, the grammar, and the commentary are related to one another, and how all three are by-products of exegesis. If this method of gathering material looks crude and haphazard to us, it must be remembered that scientific lexicography² is of very recent origin.

The important fact is that interpreters in every age have produced expository aids out of their own living relation to Scripture, and these aids have been the means by which a direct contact with Scripture could be maintained. They might be likened to the scaffolding which a building contractor erects to gain access to his working area. The greater the distance from the events referred to in Scripture and the less familiar we are with the languages in which Scripture was written, the greater the number of special helps which will be required. But what was originally intended to be a bridge to help the interpreter reach the text may become a wall which shuts him off from it. Exegetical traditions are harmful when they cease to be only the means to an end and begin to take the place of fresh creative work on the text. This is what happened in Rabbinic Judaism and in Medieval Scholasticism.

The exclusive use of the Vulgate in the Western Church was accompanied by a neglect of Greek studies. Medieval Latin scholars showed a preference for the Old Testament over the New. The most advanced exegetes of the Middle Ages, the

1 Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (2nd ed., Oxford, 1952), pp. 56, 63 ff.

2 "Lexicons were first made thousands of years ago, dictionaries on historical principles not until the nineteenth century." Deissmann, op. cit., p. 415.

Victorines, appear to have had at least a rudimentary knowledge of Hebrew¹ which they acquired through contacts with Jewish rabbis. In this supposedly arid period of biblical scholarship, Beryl Smalley has succeeded in finding some² ancestors of the modern special lexicon.

At the Reformation, biblical interpretation entered a new phase. It was a guiding principle with the Reformers that Scripture provided the norm against which Church tradition could be measured and corrected. Scripture was³ no merely formal authority; its authority was derived from its content. The exegesis of the Reformers was not the repetition of tradition, but the Church's conversation with the living Christ via Scripture. This necessitated a method which would allow the literal sense of the text to come through, for it must be

1 Smalley, op. cit., pp. 150, 191. Hebrew lexicography has advanced more rapidly than Greek lexicography, perhaps because it has been more closely associated with biblical exegesis. The Hebrew language has always been "biblical"; the Greek language is "biblical" by adoption. Greek lexicography first developed within a classical tradition which had little in common with the New Testament. Early Christian exegetes simply availed themselves of the existing helps, not realising that a dictionary based on Greek philosophers and poets was not always a reliable guide for the interpretation of the New Testament. Hebrew lexicography on the other hand, had a closer contact with the concept-world of the Old and New Testaments. For centuries it suffered from the restrictions and distortions of rabbinical exegesis, yet it never lost its connection with the Old Testament text. The first Hebrew lexicographers were the Massoretes. The most important are: Menahem ibn Saruk, who wrote a Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon in the 10th cent.; Rashi (1040-1105), who expounded the entire O.T.; David Kimchi (died 1235), who completed the significant grammatico-lexical work Michlol. See H. Bauer in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (2. Aufl.; Tuebingen, 1927), I, 982.

2 "The spiritual exposition had its 'aids to study', just as the literal exposition and theology had theirs." Smalley, op. cit., p. 246. In the 13th century William Brito compiled a dictionary of biblical terms, Vocabularium Bibliae, which Smalley says was a "very popular aid to study". Ibid., pp. 182, 334.

3 Otto Weber, Grundlagen der Dogmatik (Neukirchen, 1955), I, 225. Cf. Ludwig Diestel, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche (Jena, 1869), pp. 231 ff.

made apparent just what the original content of the biblical concept was.¹
 The contradiction between Roman ecclesiastical doctrine and the New
 Testament doctrine of the Church would then be self-evident. The New
 Testament concept of grace was compared with the Roman idea of sacramental
 grace. An ecclesiastical system of absolution and penance could not take the
 place of the forgiveness of sins effected by Christ. The Reformers appealed
 directly to the once-for-all events of Christ's Incarnation and atoning death,
 not to the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass.

Lexicography and the Historico-Critical Method. - - With the rise of
 modern science the methods of biblical lexicography underwent great changes.
 The pioneers of the historico-critical method of biblical scholarship must be
 counted among Cremer's predecessors, for without the fruits of their labours
 a work such as the Woerterbuch² would have been unthinkable. But the aims
 and presuppositions of the new grammatico-historical philology were far
 removed from that special task which Cremer was later to undertake. Hebrew

1 The Reformers were too busy with the primary task of exposition to write
 auxiliary aids such as lexicons, but they were well aware that philological
 research could be useful in the clarification of important theological concepts.
 Bucer and Calvin let lexical investigations of Greek and Hebrew words accumulate
 in their commentaries. Tholuck called Bucer "the most noteworthy representative
 of systematic historical exegesis before Calvin" and declared that he had
 "anticipated many a deep thought of modern theology". Commentary on the Sermon
on the Mount, trans. R. Lundin Brown (Edinburgh, 1860), p. 44. See also
 Tholuck's essay: "The Merits of Calvin as an Interpreter of the Holy
 Scripture," trans. Leonard Woods Jr., Biblical Repository, II (1832), 541 ff.

2 "From the end of the sixteenth century on Hollanders, Frenchmen, and
 Englishmen wrote Observationes of a purely philological nature upon isolated
 passages, especially of the N.T., mostly upon the basis of their reading in
 the Greek classics, some also in the Oriental languages and the Rabbins."
 Reuss, op. cit., p. 585. Deissmann says that "it was chiefly their material
 that supplied the later lexicographers, including those whose books we still
 use today: Wilke and Grimm, Cremer, Joseph Henry Thayer, etc." Deissmann,
op. cit., p. 417.

lexicography made progress through the study of cognate languages and through¹ the application of comparative, statistical methods. Similar advances were made in Greek lexicography. And yet, better philological knowledge was not accompanied by a proper appreciation of the theological problems connected with the language of the New Testament. The first special lexicon of the New Testament, which was published by George Pasor in 1619, had a purely linguistic² aim.

1 "It was not until within modern times that Biblical sciences actually appeared. Their cradle was found in Holland among the Arminians. It was there that the great foundation compilations were made both in classical and in Biblical philology. For the study of the Hebrew language Reuchlin's labours provided the start (1506), and his work was extended mainly by the elder Buxtorf (1629); Thesaurus Grammaticus and Lexicon." E. von Dobschuetz, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, J. Hastings, ed., (1908-21), II, 600.

"Epoche machte Albert Schultens, der statt der rabbinischen Tradition die wissenschaftliche Analogie der semitische Dialecte als Basis der hebr. Sprachforschung hinstellte Die Abhaengigkeit von den Rabbinen hatten freilich viele Gelehrte stark und unwillig empfunden und suchten dies Joch abzuschuettern, wenn auch ohne etwas Besseres zu finden Mit Schultens kommen die acht wissenschaftlichen Grundsätze hebraeischer Wortforschung zum Siege, und so macht er auch in der Lexicographie Epoche, ohne indess ein Woerterbuch verfasst zu haben." Ludwig Diestel, op. cit., pp. 450, 453-54. (Schultens died in 1750).

Diestel next considers the period from 1750 to the middle of the 19th century: "Gleich im Beginn unsrer Periode prueft J. D. Michaelis die Mittel, die 'ausgestorbene' hebr. Sprache zu verstehen und zeigt schon in dem Zwecke der Abhandlung, dass er die eigenthuemliche Schwierigkeit der lexikalischen Frage richtig ahnt Fast alle diese Versuche antiquirte Gesenius durch s. Woerterbuch In einem bisher nicht erreichten Grade hatte er aus allen Quellen der Wortforschung geschoept, . . . das Verhaeltniss zwischen dem Hebr. und den semit. Dialecten richtig aufgefasst, die Constructionen und Redewendungen moeglichst vollstaendig angegeben, Alles ausgesondert, was mehr in die Grammatik und in die Commentarien gehoerte, und die verschiedenen Klassen der Diction sorgsam unterscheiden." Ibid., pp. 572-74.

2 Deissman, op. cit., p. 416. In the development of N. T. lexicography the following are especially important: Sal. Blassius (1656), Joh. Jakob Wetstein (1754), Ernesti's school at Leipzig, J. B. Winer's grammar (1822), and C. L. W. Grimm's lexicon. Von Dobschuetz, op. cit., p. 600. See also Wilibald Grimm, "Kritisch geschichtliche Uebersicht der neutestamentlichen Verballexica seit der Reformation," Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1875), III, 479 ff.

In the early editions of his lexicon Cremer included a vast number of citations from classical Greek literature. These were chosen to illustrate the differences between classical and biblical usage. Cremer's amazing thoroughness in dealing with the classics is partly explained by the fact that he was able to avail himself of the special concordances and lexicons of classical authors prepared by German philologists.¹ In the later editions of the Woerterbuch many of these quotations from the classics had to be dropped out to save space.

We come now to the consideration of three works which have a special relation to Cremer's Woerterbuch: Flacius' Clavis Scripturae, Bengel's Gnomon Novi Testamenti, and Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik und Kritik. Diverse as these works are in regard to content, authorship, and time of writing, they each play an important part in the development which leads up to Cremer.

1 In 1834 Professor Edward Robinson of Andover Seminary, U. S. A., wrote of the need for a comparison between the language of the N. T. and that of Classical Greek: "The means of making such a comparison, thanks to the patient diligence of German editors, are now ample in respect to most of the Greek authors, though not for all. To institute the requisite comparison de novo, and solely by the aid of one's own personal reading, would indeed be a task, requiring for the accomplishment of it a life, which should not number less than several multitudes of threescore years and ten. But with such ample indexes as those of Xenophon, by Sturz; of Herodotus and Polybius, by Schweighauser; of Herodian, by Irmisch; and others . . . the labor of the comparison is brought within a narrow compass. These indexes often contain within themselves sufficient materials to make out the necessary examination; or, if not, they refer at once to the requisite passages in the text." The Biblical Repository, IV, 166-67.

For a knowledge of the theological concepts of the pagan Greeks, Cremer was especially dependent upon C. F. Naegelsbach, Homerische Theologie (3. Aufl.; Nuernburg, 1884), and Die nachhomerische Theologie des griech. Volksglaubens bis auf Alexander (Nuernburg, 1857).

Flacius' Clavis. -- The study of Flacius takes us back to the second half of the sixteenth century to the interpretative problems created by the Roman Catholic reaction to the Reformation. The Council of Trent sought to discredit the Reformation Scripture principle by ruling that tradition was of equal authority with Scripture. Roman Catholic controversialists declared that Scripture was difficult to understand and inaccessible, that it could not be rightly interpreted without the aid of tradition. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches were obliged to make a more incisive statement of their views on the clarity, the sufficiency, and the independence of Scripture. According to Dilthey, hermeneutics as a science first arose out of this struggle for¹ authority, out of this contest between Scripture and tradition. Flacius gave Protestant hermeneutics its decisive formulation in his Clavis Scripturae (1567). Flacius is important not only for an understanding of Cremer, but also² in relation to the current discussion of hermeneutics.

His Clavis is in two parts. The first part is a Latin concordance to Scripture; the second part contains his hermeneutics proper together with a miscellaneous assortment of aids to Bible study. Dilthey has summarized the aim of this work as stated in the two prefaces. The perversion of Scripture by Roman Catholic exegesis has been due to ignorance of the biblical languages

1 Wilhelm Dilthey's Gesammelte Schriften, (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914), II, 115 ff.

2 "Gegen zwei Fronten hatte Flacius zu kaempfen. Sowohl die Wiedertaeufer als der restaurirte Katholicismus behaupteten die Dunkelheit der heiligen Schrift. Indem Flacius sich dem entgegenstellt, lernt er besonders von der Exegese Calvins, welche von der Auslegung vielfach auf die Grundsaeetze derselben zurueckgegangen war." Wilhelm Dilthey, "Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik," Philosophische Abhandlungen (Tuebingen, 1900), p. 195.

and to the influence of Aristotelian philosophy.¹ Undoubtedly Flacius' lexical concordance was meant to counteract the linguistic deficiency. It provides the preliminary foundation for his hermeneutical theory. In his handling of the biblical vocabulary he has sought to show how the concepts are all interrelated. As a corrective to the dicta of Aristotle, Flacius has developed a synthetic method. His first hermeneutical canon is that Scripture² is to be understood as a whole in terms of its inner unity. This emphasis on the perspicuity, unity, and independence of Scripture suggests an affinity between Flacius and Cremer. Cremer was familiar with Flacius' Clavis and³ referred to it occasionally.

Bengel's Gnomon. -- In John Albert Bengel we find another important predecessor of Cremer. Although Bengel had much in common with Pietism and the

1 "Habe man die Schrift nicht verstanden, so sei das nicht die Schuld ihrer Unverstaendlichkeit; sondern der mangelhaften Sprachstudien, welche die Lehrer zu ihrer Erklaerung hinzugebracht, und der falschen Methode, deren sie bedient haetten In der Tat, hier in der Mitte zwischen dem Schriftprinzip und dem materiellen Prinzip der Reformation: in dem Begreifen und Durchleben des inneren Zusammenhangs, welcher unter und zwischen allen Teilen der Schrift lebendig besteht, lag das reformatorische Erlebnis. Dieser Zusammenhang musste den Grundgedanken der protestantischen Hermeneutik bilden. So koennen wir die Absicht dieses Werkes dahin bestimmen: es will von dem reformatorischen Gedanken des einheitlichen Zusammenhangs der Schrift aus durch ein Organon der Exegese die normative Selbstaeendigkeit der Schrift erweisen." Dilthey, Gesammelte Schriften, II, 118-19.

2 Ibid., p. 121. Flacius had been trained as a philologist and knew how to study biblical concepts. "Der Clavis ging ein andrer Versuch voraus: *Regulae et tractatus quidam de sermone literarum*. Magd. 1551. In einer gleichzeitigen Schrift *de vocabulo fidei* sucht er die versch. Anwendung von $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ und $\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ im A. u. N. T. aus den Zeitverhaeltnissen zu erklaren. Seine Kenntniss des Hebraeischen war fuer seine Zeit bedeutend, verleitet ihn jedoch zu kuehnen Etymologieen." Diestel, op. cit., n. p. 252.

3 See Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 272; Cremer-Koegel, p. 299; Cremer, "Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes," BFTh, I (1897), 4, pp. 52-53; Cremer, article on "Fleisch," PRE, VI, 98.

1

Great Awakening, he was not a narrow sectarian. He upheld the Reformation principle that Scripture is its own interpreter. In the preface to his Gnomon of the New Testament (1742) he expressed regret that the method of expounding Scripture "which is offered by Scripture itself, has not as yet prevailed to any great extent in the Church. . . . The Gnomon points the way with sufficient clearness. If you are wise, the text itself teaches you all things." Like Flacius, he wished to see Scripture as a unity, to discover the "full and comprehensive force of Scripture in its whole connection".² His views on the language of Scripture are very similar to those expressed later by Schleiermacher and Cremer:

In order to weigh precisely the force of the words, it is essential to observe the Hebraism with which the language of the Greek New Testament is tinged. It is beyond question, that the Apostles and Evangelists were accustomed to speak and write in such a style as was especially suited to the Hellenizing Jews resident in Asia and elsewhere, who had introduced the spirit of the Hebrew language into their ordinary Greek discourse, and to whom the Greek translation of the Old Testament (which Hebraizes to a very great degree) was evidently familiar . . . The whole and perpetual spirit of the language employed by the writers of the New Testament is distinctively Hebraizing, and differs in this respect decidedly from the style of other Greek³ authors, though here and there resemblances are to be found . . .

Bengel saw the connection between the Old and New Testaments as an inner relation of promise and fulfilment. This idea may be seen again later in

1 He wrote in the preface to Burk's Gnomon on the Twelve Minor Prophets: "The Scriptures support the Church; the Church guards the Scriptures. When the Church flourishes, the Scriptures are had in honour; and when the Church becomes sickly, the Scriptures suffer by it. Whatever be the condition of the Church at any period, the Scriptures are treated accordingly." Quoted by A. R. Fausset in "Sketch of the Life and Writings of J.A. Bengel," Gnomon of the New Testament, trans. William Fletcher (Edinburgh 1858), V,xxix.

2 Bengel, Gnomon of the New Testament, Eng. tr., I, 8-9. Gnomon means "signpost". Karl Hermann says of Bengel: "Er will zur Schrift so hinfuehren, dass sie selbst zu leuchten beginne . . ." Johann Albrecht Bengel, der Klosterpraeceptor von Denkendorf (Stuttgart, 1937), p. 392.

3 Bengel, op. cit., I, 46.

Tholuck. In his Gnomon Bengel has constantly referred significant or¹ difficult words back to the Septuagint and the Hebrew Old Testament. To be sure, there are certain features of Bengel's exegesis which detract from its value. He held to the old Orthodox view of inspiration as a divine dictation; many of his judgments do not stand the test of historical criticism; he had a fondness for Chiliastic speculation and computed fanciful chronologies of eschatological events. But these defects notwithstanding, his work has a lasting significance for hermeneutics and biblical theology. His relation to Cremer may be traced through Collenbusch and Beck. The influence of Bengel² is particularly evident in Cremer's Eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi and there are numerous citations from Bengel's Gnomon in the Woerterbuch.

Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik und Kritik. -- In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries there was a very active interest in the method-³ ology of biblical interpretation. The highest achievement in this "Golden Age" of hermeneutics was Schleiermacher's Hermeneutik und Kritik. Characteristics of both the Enlightenment and the Great Awakening merge in Schleiermacher. He combined the critical acumen of Ernesti with the mysticism of⁴ Herder. He was Pietist, Rationalist, and Romanticist all in one. It was a

¹ See, for example, his notes on יהוה and κύριος as names of God (Rev. 1.8). ibid., V, 194 ff.

² See Cremer's preface, vi.

³ Many notable works on hermeneutics appeared between 1760 and 1840. A few of them are: J. A. Ernesti, Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti (1761, 5th ed. 1809); S. J. Baumgarten, Ausführlicher Vortrag der biblischen Hermeneutik (1769); L. Bauer, Hermeneutica sacra Veteris Testamenti (1797); G. W. Meyer, Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments (1799-1800). (See Fr. Torm, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments Göttingen, 1930, pp. 34 f.) Schleiermacher patterned his Hermeneutik und Kritik after Ernesti's Institutio.

⁴ Cf. Joachim Wach, Das Verstehen: Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie im 19. Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1926-33), I, 25.

fundamental principle with him that theology and science should not be divorced¹ from each other. Philology and theology should work together.²

Schleiermacher's theory of understanding as developed in his Hermeneutik und Kritik is that in addition to grammatico-historical interpretation there is a psychological interpretation. Language has a thought-side as well as a speech-side. Not only the outward form, but also the inner content must be considered.³ Every great intellectual or cultural movement produces changes of meaning in the inner thought-world and these changes affect language. So too Christianity has played its part in the language-moulding process. The language of the New Testament, however, presents a special problem because the thought-world and the speech-world do not coincide. The language is Greek, but the thought-world is predominantly Hebraic.⁴ To arrive at the correct meaning of a given word in the New Testament it is necessary to make a careful investigation of every factor which has affected its meaning and to trace out each historical phase through which the concept has passed. This involves a

1 "Soll der Knoten der Geschichte so auseinander gehen; das Christentum mit der Barbarei, die Wissenschaft mit dem Unglauben?" Theolog. Stud. u. Kritik. (1829), p. 149. Quoted by Wach, op. cit., II, 48.

2 Schleiermacher failed to establish any lasting union between theology and philology. His predecessors and immediate successors were philologists but not theologians. "Schon sein Schueler und Erbe, Boeckh . . . lebte nicht mehr in dem festen fruchtbaren Zusammenhang mit der Theologie, die Schleiermacher genaeht hat . . ." Wach, Op. cit., I, 25. Cf. I, 23, 31 f., 83.

3 Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik und Kritik, hrsg. Fr. Luecke (Berlin, 1838), pp. 9-13.

4 "Die neutest. Schriftsteller waren nicht gewohnt in der griechischen Sprache zu denken, wenigstens nicht ueber religioese Gegenstaende. . . . Aber selbst die Griechen waren auf dem Gebiete des Hebraismus Christen geworden . . . Der neue christliche Geist aber tritt im N. T. hervor in einer Sprachmischung, in der das hebraeische der Stamm ist, worin das neue zunaechst gedacht worden ist, das griechische aber aufgepfropft. Deshalb ist das neutest. Hermeneutik als eine specielle zu behandeln." Ibid., pp. 27-28.

comparison of the usage in all the documents in which the word is known to occur. By this method of comparison the unique elements in the New Testament¹ thought-world will be made apparent. Without a preliminary study of this kind no scientifically accurate exegesis can be accomplished.

Schleiermacher found that the lexicons then available left much to be desired in this respect. Cremer borrowed the phrase "the language-moulding power of Christianity"² from Schleiermacher, and it is evident that he is also indebted to him for the method which he has employed in the Woerterbuch. Cremer was not content to derive his definitions from the usages of classical Greek, but compared non-biblical usage with biblical to determine the degree of similarity or difference. He found the Septuagint to be of prime importance, not only because the New Testament writers appropriated Old Testament concepts, but also because the Greek of the Septuagint furnished a precedent to assist them in³ rendering Hebrew ideas into Greek.

1 "Dabei ist der Kanon zu beobachten, dass man wo es sich um eine eigenthuemliche Gebrauchsweise handelt alles was ein Wort eigenthuemlich gilt zusammenfasst, um es zu solchem Verstehen zu bringen, wobei die Eigenthuemlichkeit der neutest. Sprache auch im Einzelnen scharf begriffen wird." Ibid., p.69.

Compare Schleiermacher's statement with this one by Cremer: "Es genuegt nicht, zu diesem Zwecke durch einfache Citate nachzuweisen, ob und in welchem Masse das betreffende Wort sich ueberhaupt auch in der Profan-Graecitaet im Gebrauch befunden habe. Vielmehr muss die Begriffssphaere des ausserbiblischen Gebrauchs nachgewiesen und der Unterschied wie die Verwandtschaft der biblischen Vorstellung und der Anknuepfungspunkt aufgewiesen werden, vgl. z. B. ἁγιος, ἱερός." Woerterbuch, 6th ed., iv.

2 Cremer, ET, iv.

3 According to Schleiermacher "der Weg zum neutest. Sprachschatze geht aber von klassischen Alterthum aus durch die makedonische Graecitaet, die juedischen Schriftsteller Josephus und Philo, die deuterokanonischen Schriften und die LXX als die staerkste Annaehrung zum hebraeischen". Schleiermacher, op. cit., p.34.

Cremer's method agrees with Schleiermacher's at every step: "Die neutestamentliche Heilsverkuendigung in griechischer Sprache hat ihre geschichtliche

While Cremer followed Schleiermacher in his methodology he did not follow him in his theological appraisal of the results. Schleiermacher held that the "language-moulding power of Christianity" was a scientifically demonstrable fact, quite apart from any theological presuppositions. Cremer agreed that a scientific method was indispensable, but he did not force a separation between the phenomena under investigation and the theological object of those phenomena. This, in effect, was what Schleiermacher did. Schleiermacher maintained that a philologist and a theologian would look at the biblical language from different points of view. The philologist would be chiefly interested in the peculiarities of the language, while the theologian would be concerned with the uniqueness of Christianity itself. A theologian who used a sound philological method could also endeavor to bring the uniqueness¹ of Christianity into view.

Was Schleiermacher right in making the uniqueness of Christianity the object of his inquiry? Is the Church as an institution essentially different from other institutions? Is Christian religious experience qualitatively different from other religious experience? Christian piety, too, is a demonstrable fact without any theological presuppositions. What is it to which the language and existence of the Church point? That, and not Christianity as such, is the proper object of theology. A union between philology and theology

Voraussetzung in der Uebersetzung des A. T. durch die Septuaginta
 Zwischen den LXX und dem N. T. stehen die alttestamentlichen Apokryphen
 Fuer die begriffsgeschichtliche Seite der Untersuchung kommen noch Philo und Josephus, namentlich Ersterer, in Betracht." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., v-vi.

1 Schleiermacher, op. cit., p. 68.

on Schleiermacher's terms could only mean that the history and psychology of religion would become a substitute for theology. This is exactly what did happen in the nineteenth century. Schleiermacher performed a great service for hermeneutics by demonstrating that the outward form of a word is not always the measure of its inner content, but he did not go far enough. A word is indeed a sign of a thought, but behind every thought there must be an object.

Schleiermacher gave Cremer a starting point philologically and psychologically. Theologically, however, there is an important difference. Where Schleiermacher spoke of the Christian spirit (christliche Geist) Cremer spoke of the Spirit of Christ (Geist Christi).¹ Schleiermacher has grounded the biblical concepts in the experience of the Church; Cremer has grounded them in the living Person of Christ who is present in the Church through His Spirit. There is a distinction between faith and the One who is the content and object of that faith.

Aims

Cremer was desirous that his work be taken seriously, not simply as a hypothesis, but as a scientific investigation which had produced demonstrable

1 Ibid., pp. 27-28. Cf. Cremer, op. cit., iii.

In addition to Schleiermacher, Cremer mentions two other men in the preface to his Woerterbuch: Richard Rothe and Gerhard von Zezschwitz. Rothe, who was a professor of dogmatics at Heidelberg, will be discussed in connection with Cremer's doctrine of Scripture. In 1859 von Zezschwitz, a professor at Leipzig, published a monograph entitled: Profanraecitaet und biblischer Sprachgeist, eine Vorlesung ueber die biblische Umbildung hellenischer Begriffe besonders der psychologischen. Although Cremer cites this work, he could not have been dependent upon it for the basic principle of his lexicon, for he had already begun his own research two years before this monograph appeared. See Kaehler, op. cit., p. 12.

philological results.¹ It is this striving after a scientific method which makes him most akin to Schleiermacher. His was an "attempt to reform and scientifically to reconstruct New Testament lexicography".² His first aim was to show the distinctive features of the New Testament language:

. . . The expressions of that language received a new meaning, and terms hackneyed and worn out by the current misuse of daily talk received a new impress and fresh power The spirit of the language expands, and makes itself adequate to the new views which the Spirit of Christ reveals. The speaker's or writer's range of view must change as the starting-point and goal of all his judgments change; and this change will not only modify the import and range of conceptions already existing, but will lead to the formation of new conceptions and relationships.³

Cremer's second aim was to assist the exegete. "One of the most essential tasks of a lexicon of New Testament Greek," he wrote, "would be the unburdening of exegesis."⁴ Judging by the quantity of interpretative material in the Woerterbuch⁵ he has been notably successful in this regard. He has endeavored to throw light

1 "Als H Cremer sein Woerterbuch verfasste, wollte er nicht eine Dogmatik in alphabetischer Gliederung schreiben, sondern er hat ein echt philologisches Interesse; das neue Gewicht und Gepraege der griechischen Worte im NT herauszustellen. Er war allerdings der Meinung, dass gruendliche Untersuchungen der Theologie und dem praktischen Amte zugute kommen." Gerhard Friedrich, TWNT, V, iv.

2 Cremer, ET, vii.

3 Ibid., iv.

4 Cremer, Woerterbuch 6th ed., vii.

5 The N. T. books most frequently cited and the number of exegetical references to each are as follows:

<u>Book</u>	<u>No. of Citations</u>
Romans	248
Hebrews	180
Matthew	151
Fourth Gospel	121
I Corinthians	121
Revelation	67

(Compiled from the index of the 10th German edition, "Verzeichnis der Stellen im N. T. die ausfuehrlicher behandelt sind." pp. 1207-16).

upon difficult passages of Scripture and to explain certain expressions which are a perennial problem to the interpreter.¹ By way of illustration we may turn to the article on ἄγγελος where he discusses the meaning of the expression "the angels of the seven churches" (Rev. 1.20), or we may look at his explanation of the "four living creatures" (Rev. 4.6-9).² He has dealt with the well known passage (I Cor. 11.10) in which Paul admonishes women to keep their heads covered "because of the angels," and he has investigated the peculiar Pauline usage of σπέρματι and σπέρμασι (Gal. 3.16).³ In accordance with this same aim he supplies information about the word "Gehenna" (Mt. 5.22,29-30).⁴ His explanation of μονογενὴς θεός (John 1.18), and of the phrase "high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (Heb. 6.20 ff.) are also of interest.⁵

The Woerterbuch is a gathering place for Cremer's own exegesis; and, in addition, it is a highly condensed compendium of exegetical literature ancient and modern. Cremer has utilized a vast number of lexicons, monographs, and commentaries in his search for insights into the meaning of individual concepts.

1 The Church has been occupied with this task since the early centuries of her history. Among the ancients ἑρμηνεία (ἑρμηνεύειν) sometimes meant the translation or explanation of difficult passages in a written text. Hence, for the Greek and Latin Fathers, hermeneutics was the elucidation of dark or obscure portions of Scripture. Cf. Peter Brunner, "Charismatische und Methodische Schriftauslegung nach Augustins Prolog zu De doctrina christiana," Kerygma und Dogma, I, 1 (1955), pp. 59-60. "Die Auslegung die Augustin im Auge hat, wird durch die Dunkelheiten in der Schrift notwendig. . . . Nicht die Schrift ist dunkel, aber fuer den, der sie verstehen will, finden sich in ihr Dinge, Stellen, Teile, die zunaechst dunkel sind."

2 Cremer, ET, pp. 19, 274.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 237; Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 811 ff.

4 Cremer, ET, p. 146.

5 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 411; Cremer-Koegel, pp. 854-55.

In the later editions he provided bibliographies for some of the major articles. These may prove highly useful in one's own personal research. The bibliographies at the beginning of each article in Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament serve the same purpose on a far larger scale.

Cremer's third aim was to provide a "scriptural basis" for theology. Theological thought had been too much governed by a humanist tradition which stood in opposition to the biblical mode of thought. He declared that "the common complaint over the inadequacy of the concepts with which theology is wont to reckon is well-founded only in the case of those concepts which have been more or less detached from their biblical foundation and original clarity, which have, I might say, been naturalised again." ² In effect, Cremer has reaffirmed the Reformation doctrine of the perspicuitas of Scripture. There was a widely felt need for a lexicon which would serve as a source-book for biblical theology and dogmatics, and the Woerterbuch was designed to meet that need. ³

1 In the 6th ed. the following articles have bibliographies:

ἄγγελος	pp. 22 f.	συνείδησις	348	πιστεύω	725
ἄγιος	39 f.	ἐπερώτημα	387	περίσμος	731
ἁγίος	79 f.	καρδία	489	πνεῦμα	759
αἰών	96	λόγος	554 f	σάρξ	780, 788
ἀληθεῖα	119	μισθός	604	σοφία	809
βασιλεία	190, 196	νόμος	619	στοιχεῖον	820
δαίμων	247	ὄνομα	657	ὀρθοτομέω	841
δικαίος	272	ὄργη	667	διαθήκη	847

2 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., v.

3 Von Zezschwitz (op. cit., p. 10) exclaimed: "Haetten wir nur erst - es ist ja die gemeinsame Klage der Theologen der Gegenwart - eine von den unterscheidenden Grundgedanken des Christenthums aus principiell bearbeitete Clavis der biblischen Graecitaet!" And it was precisely this kind of lexicon which Cremer meant to provide: "Deshalb wird ein solches Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecitaet Vorzugsweise ein biblisch-theologisches sein muessen, ein Woerterbuch welches vor Allem diejenigen Ausdruecke untersucht, die einen biblisch theologischen Inhalt haben Darum muss, wie Gerh. v. Zezschwitz in seinem lichtvollen Schriftchen 'Profangraecitaet und biblischer Sprachgeist' sich ausdrueckt, ein solches Woerterbuch eine von den Grundgedanken des Christenthums aus principiell bearbeitete Clavis sein." Woerterbuch, 6th ed., iv-v.

Results

When one has read the Woerterbuch in its entirety he has an over all view of the theological language of the New Testament. The characteristic of this language which makes the deepest and most lasting impression is the contrast between biblical concepts and Greek modes of thought.¹ The examples which follow have been chosen to illustrate different aspects of that contrast.² The Woerterbuch does not contain every word to be found in the Greek New Testament. Cremer, who selected only those words with a special theological significance, investigated about one fifth of the approximately 5000 words in the New Testament vocabulary. Kittel has rightly warned us against trying to schematize the results of this type of research. "The primitive Christian writer sought in no way to schematize his words. He never shaped his terminology to fit in with any prearranged plan." A biblical word may have a theological content in one instance and not in another. The usages of the same word may range from the commonplace to the deeply theological.³ Keeping these considerations in mind we may proceed to examine some of the striking changes in meaning which have occurred in the biblical vocabulary.

Profane Greek and New Testament Usage. - - (1) Certain words which were

1 "Soweit aber das Christentum den ausgepraegtesten und bewusstesten Gegensatz gegen das (im pneumatischen Sinne) Natuerlich-Menschliche enthaelt, wird auch gerade die griechische Sprache als das Spiegelbild eines reichen und vollen natuerlichen Lebens, im Dienste des Heiligtums diesen Gegensatz abspiegeln." Ibid., iii.

2 Gerhard Kittel, Lexicographia Sacra, Two lectures on the Making of the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ("Theology Occasional Papers," No. 7 London, 1938,) has given a similar outline of the special characteristics of the N. T. language. I am indebted to him in some instances for my choice of illustrations. In each case, however, the same result was already to be found in Cremer's Woerterbuch. Fr. Torm. op. cit., pp. 59, 64-69, has listed some different kinds of semantic changes found in the N. T.

3 Kittel, op. cit., p. 14.

inconspicuous and rather colourless in classical and Hellenistic Greek come very much to the forefront in the New Testament. They may be used to express a concept for which there is no parallel in Greek thinking. (a) The distinctive New Testament term for holy and divine love was ἀγάπη "while the Greeks knew only ἔρως, φιλία and στοργή . . . The Deity exists not to love, but to be loved,"¹ said Aristotle. Thus, the love exhibited in Christ's work of redemption was something radically new. "Whatever He is, He is not for Himself, but for us."² (b) In profane Greek ζωή denoted ordinary existence, this present life in an external sense. Yet this is the very word which the New Testament uses when it speaks of the new life in Christ, ζωή αἰώνιος.³ (c) In classical literature πιστεύειν was not essentially a religious word. Although the substantive πίστις was used to denote belief in the gods, the corresponding verb was usually νομίζειν, rarely πιστεύειν.⁴ In the New Testament, however, πιστεύειν assumes a position of prominence in the religious

1 Cremer, ET, p. 11. Cf. Cremer-Koegel, pp. 9-10: "Ἐρᾶν . . . im N.T. gar nicht findet . . . Im A.T. wie ganz bes. im N.T. ueberall, wo es sich um die d. Gebiete d. Offenbarungsrel. eigentueml. Liebe handelt, konsequent ἀγαπᾶν gebraucht wird, waehrend φιλεῖν durchaus keine eigentueml. Faerbung angenommen hat." Cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 19: ". . . when several different words are open to choice, the one most indefinite to a Greek ear is chosen. . . . Ἀγάπη was in Greek a comparatively nondescript word, and just because of this it was chosen as Biblical language and given a central place in the Christian proclamation."

2 Cremer, ET, pp. 14 f. (I Jn. 4.8) "Cf. Torm, op. cit., p. 90: "Durch den Gebrauch dieser Worte auf griechischem und juedischem Boden werden wir also in unserm Verstaendnis nicht gefoerdert, sondern sind ausschliesslich auf das N.T. selbst angewiesen." The N.T. conception of love (I Jn. 4.10, I Cor. 13) "hat sicher ihren Hintergrund in der Person Jesu, die fuer die christliche Betrachtung als die vollkommene Widerspiegelung der Liebe Gottes dasteht."

3 Cremer, ET, p. 272. Cremer-Koegel, p. 469: "Dadurch stellt sich d. Abweichung d. Sprachgebr. in d. bibl. Graez. von d. prof. heraus, in Zusammenhang mit d. gesamten Gedankenwelt . . ."

4 Cremer, ET, pp. 478 ff., 486, 832.

vocabulary. The word has received new connotations through its association with the Hebrew לְבַטָּח (LXX $\text{לְבַטָּח} = \text{πιστεύειν}$). The New Testament πίστις combines the Hebrew idea of "a firmly relying trust" with the Greek idea of "acknowledgment and conviction".¹ (d) Some other words which show a qualitative deepening of meaning in their biblical usage are ἐλπίς , ἀγιος , πλῆσιον .

(2) Many of the leading concepts of pagan Greek culture recede into the background in the New Testament or disappear altogether.² (a) Words expressive of the highest pagan morality were found to be inadequate to describe the righteousness and truth revealed in Jesus Christ. Words like ἀρετή , δικαιοσύνη , ἐὺσεβεία occur but seldom in the New Testament, and then chiefly in the Pastoral Epistles where the language is closest to the ordinary Hellenistic usage.³ (b) The basic elements in the Apostolic kerygma do not harmonize with the Weltanschauung of Greek philosophy. It is no accident that the word ἀναστήσις occurs only twice in the New Testament. The witness of the Apostles to Christ's bodily resurrection has nothing to do with the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul.⁴

The Septuagint. - - (1) Similar peculiarities may be seen in the language of the LXX. There are instances where the Semitic thought-modes of the Hebrew Old Testament have displaced the normal content of Greek words or necessitated the use of unusual words. There is a strong resistance to Greek thought at some points. It is noteworthy, for example, that the LXX does not "Hellenize"

1 Ibid., p. 482.

2 Cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 16.

3 "Während nun d. Begriff d. ἀρετή im sittl. Sinne in Prof. Graez. eine so hervorragende Stelle inne hat, dass sie als d. Inbegriff aller sittl. Tüchtigkeit u. Leistungen erscheint, tritt er in dieser Bedeutung in d. bibl. Graez. in auffallender Weise zurück." Cremer-Koegel, pp. 161 f. See Cremer on δικαιοσύνη ET, pp. 611 ff. (Cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 19), and on ἐὺσεβεία , ET, p. 525.

4 Cremer-Koegel, p. 497. Cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 17.

the technical terminology of the Hebrew cult. The Alexandrian Jews who made the translation seemed particularly anxious to avoid religious concepts associated with the pagan cults. (a) ἱερός, the usual Greek word for sacred things, is seldom used in the LXX. "As the peculiarly ritualistic word of profane Greek, it must have appeared to the LXX much too profane . . . to be used in the place of the Scripture ¹ שִׁטָּר." The Jerusalem temple is almost never called τὸ ἱερόν (only in I Chron. 29.4 and Ezek. 45.19). "Only the Apocrypha of the O.T. betrays here the influence of the worldly diction. There ἱερόν is quite the familiar term for the temple."² (b) ἱλάσκομαι was a pagan religious technical term, but in the LXX it does not convey the usual Greek idea of sacrifice:

"... the biblical notion expressed by שָׁחַט differs decidedly from the profane idea. ἱλάσκεσθαι can only have been chosen as the best equivalent, because it was the set expression for expiatory acts, though the idea lying at the foundation of heathen expiations is rejected by the Bible. . . . Nothing happens to God, as is the case in the heathen view; therefore we never read in the Bible ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεόν. Rather something happens to man, who escapes the wrath to come (cf. Matt. iii.7, Rom. v.9; 1 Thess. v.9)."³

(2) The LXX is the product of Hellenistic Judaism, and as such it is not entirely free from Greek influence. (a) Cremer observed that the translators did not always render the Hebrew original correctly; "they sometimes simply substituted Greek ideas".⁴ (i) The LXX of Isaiah 31.3 (Heb.

) reads: - a proof that "the LXX did not understand the literal sense of the Hebrew, or have transformed it into the antithesis of spirit and matter which was familiar to them."⁵ At any

1 Cremer, ET, p. 293.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 293. Cremer has quoted von Zezschwitz, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 302 f.

4 *Ibid.*, v.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 847.

rate, the Hebrew thought-form has been replaced by a Greek thought-form. Sometimes the LXX translation of רָצוֹן is ὁμολογία (Lev. 6.10, et al, I K. 21.27), another indication of Hellenistic influence. In both instances there is a lack of feeling for the strong concreteness of the Hebrew conception.¹ (ii) In classical Greek ἀληθής means actual, true in the sense of agreement with reality. In the LXX it is used to translate ΕΙΡΩΝ, which is a basically different concept. The fundamental idea of ΕΙΡΩΝ is "firm, sure . . . reliable". "So far as we can ascertain," says Cremer, "ἀληθής is only used where classical writers would have used it, so that its meaning has not been expanded by the Hebrew idea."²

(b) Cremer found that the Greek influence was stronger in the apocryphal books than it was in the canonical books of the LXX. (i) The word ἀθανασία which does not occur in the canonical LXX, is found in the Book of Wisdom (f.1; 8.13, 17; 15.3) and in IV Maccabees (14.5).³ (ii) Εὐσεβεία occurs seldom in the LXX, but often in Wisd., Ecclus., II and IV Macc.⁴ (iii) In classical Greek, καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός "denoted a man, as he ought to be; apt and competent in outward matters; upright and reliable in sentiment - a man of honour." But the expression is not found in the LXX outside of the Apocrypha (Tob. 7.7, II Macc. 15.12).⁵ (iv) To the Greeks, πρόνοια meant divine forethought, God's providence in the ordering of nature. This conception is foreign

1 Cremer-Koegel, p. 977. A prime example of Hellenizing (not given by Cremer) is Ex. 3.14. The MT has: אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, but the LXX renders this: ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ὢν. See C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London, 1935), p. 4. Cf. G. A. F. Knight, A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, ("Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers," No. 1 Edinburgh, 1953), p. 7. For some further illustrations of the interplay of Hebraic and Hellenistic thought in the LXX see Dodd, op. cit., pp. 9 f., 16 ff, 25 ff.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 85

3 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 417.

4 Cremer, ET, p. 525.

5 Ibid., p. 341.

to Scripture except for the Apocrypha, where, "in some places . . . it bars and weakens the conception of God's electing love in the economy of redemption" (Wisd. 14.3; III Macc. 4.21; IV Macc. 9.24, 13.18, 17.22).¹ (v) Similarly, in their usage of πατήρ, the apocryphal books generalize the concept of the fatherhood of God, "and from the special covenant relation evolve a natural relationship" (Ecclus. 23.1,4).² (vi) φιλόθεωρος ". . . in spite of its primary noble meaning, . . . occurs neither in the list of Israelitish nor in that of Christian virtues. . . . In a few places in the Apocrypha the adjective φιλόθεωρος occurs, and the substantive oftener" (Wisd. 1.6, 7.22, 12.18). "This is not a deepening of the profane meaning but is akin with the weakening of the recognition of God in Israel indicated in πρόνοια and πατήρ."³

(3) Cremer made the linguistic connection between the LXX and the New Testament the special object of his investigation.⁴ The New Testament writers did not always follow the precedent established by the LXX. (a) This may be seen in the New Testament usage of the word χάρις. Cremer notes that "the N.T. χάρις is not identical with the χάρις of the LXX. In the LXX χάρις is usually the rendering adopted for the Hebrew יָרַח, which has almost the same comprehension and range as the Greek word. It signifies gracefulness, agreeableness, Ps. xlv.3;

1 Ibid., p. 794.

2 Ibid., p.470

3 Ibid., pp. 637 f.

4 "Eine grosse Reihe von Woertern ist von den LXX fest ausgepraegt fuer bestimmte Begriffe . . . und geht unveraendert in die neutestamentliche Diction ueber, z. B. προσεύχεσθαι, εὐλαγέειν, καρδιά, λαός u. a. Ein anderer Teil aber findet sich im N.T. gar nicht oder nur selten wieder, indem entweder die Uebersetzung der LXX ueberhaupt nicht genuegte - vgl. βέβηλος und κοινός - oder fuer die neutestamentliche Vertiefung und Bereicherung nicht mehr genuegte, vgl. ὁσιος, ἔλεος, πεποιθένα bei den LXX, ἁγιος, χάρις, πιστεύειν im N. T. Wieder bei einem anderen Teile ist die an das Hebraeische anschliessende Vorstellung ganz oder teilweise aufgegeben, teils unter Einwirkung des profanen Sprachgebrauchs, teils unter Einwirkung der neutestamentlichen Heils- und Wahrheitserkenntnis, vgl. διαθήκη, λειτουργεῖν u. a." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., v-vi.

Prov. i. 9, v. 19, etc; also kindness of disposition towards, grace." ¹ In the New Testament χάρις denotes the spontaneous act of God as He inclines Himself to sinful man in and through Christ. "The N. T. χάρις rather corresponds with the O. T. חֶסֶד which the LXX usually translate ἔλεος." But the Greek leaves out one vital element contained in the O. T. חֶסֶד: God's grace in ² relation to sin. Ἐλεος is "an appropriate word for God's merciful economy which meets the wants of human woe," and it still has a place in the New Testament, especially in passages "where God's gracious dealings are regarded as tending to the salvation of mankind" (Lk. 1.54, et al; Rom. 9.23, 11.31, 15.8-9; I Pet. 1.3). ³

(b) The word δαθίκη sometimes has different connotations in the New Testament than it has in the LXX. In classical and Hellenistic Greek δαθίκη

1 Cremer, ET, p. 575.

2 Ibid., p. 575. Cf. Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 362: "Die eigentliche an die Stelle des alttestamentl. getretene neutestamentl. Ausdruck ist jedoch welches insofern fuer die neutestamentl. Anschauung geeigneter ist, als darin die Freiheit u. Unbedingtheit der goetl. Liebe mehr hervortritt, ein Moment, welches bei ἔλεος nur Tit. 3,5 hervorgehoben ist: οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὡν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς.

N.H. Snaith takes essentially the same view: "The main and characteristic NT use of the word grace (Gk. charis) is of God's redemptive love which is always active to save sinners and maintain them in proper relationship with him. In this sense the equivalent OT word is the Heb. chesed . . . It was impossible for Paul . . . to use the normal Gk. equivalent for the Heb. chesed, because this is generally rendered by eleos (pity) in the Septuagint. This rendering he knew to be wholly inadequate. It did not emphasize the long-suffering of God, and his patience with which he so long forbears to punish sin." A Theological Word Book of the Bible, Alan Richardson, ed. (London, 1950), p. 101. Cf. C. H. Dodd, op. cit., e. g., Bultmann, article on ἔλεος, TWNT, II, pp. 474-82; also the literature cited by him: N. Glueck, "Das Wort hesed im alt. lichen Sprachgebrauche" Beih. ZAW, XLVII (1927); W. F. Lofthouse, "Hen and Hesed in the Old Testament," ZAW, NF X (1933), pp. 29-35; L. Gulkowitsch, Die Entwicklung des Begriffes hasid im AT (1934).

3 Cremer, ET, p. 249. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 480, gives fuller consideration to the N. T. usages of ἔλεος. "Gottes ἔλεος ist seine heilsgeschichtlich-eschatologische Tat in Christus, wie es in dogmatischer Formulierung seinen Ausdruck Tt 3,5 findet: κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος . . ."

is a legal term meaning will or testament. In the LXX, where it is the regular equivalent for $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, it takes on the Hebrew idea of agreement, covenant relationship. Greek and Hebrew ideas intermingle in the New Testament usage of $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$. The usage of the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and Revelation generally agrees with the LXX, but in the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews we encounter the Greek idea of testament.¹ Although Paul's mode of expression is Greek, the close connection with the Old Testament remains. " $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ is not a specifically N. T. conception; it grew up with and into that of the promise, and the fulfilment of the promise caused it to disappear."² Thus, "in the N. T. the idea of sonship took the place of that of covenant. . . ."³

1 Cremer says that since $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ in Heb. 9.17 "clearly and unquestionably signifies testament, it seems best to take this as the meaning of the word throughout the Epistle. The same holds of $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ as used by St. Paul. In Gal. iii. 15, 17, the $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ of the O. T. is quite as a matter of course taken to mean $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ in the sense of testament, and it seems best to explain the word thus in the other passages, viz. Rom. ix. 4, xi. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14; Gal. iv. 24; Eph. ii. 12." Cremer, ET, pp. 552-53.

Behm, TWNT, II, 132 ff., views the matter in a different light. He thinks Cremer was wrong to lay so much stress on the idea of testament. He contends that Paul's adoption of the Hellenistic legal conception of $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ was only for the sake of illustrative analogy: "das Bild aus der Rechtsphaere soll den Vorgang aus der Heilsgeschichte anschaulich machen. . . . der religioese Begriff $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ ist bei Paulus durch LXX bestimmt, nicht durch den landlauefigen rechtlichen Sinne des Wortes." So also with the author of Hebrews (9.16 f.). "Er springt wegen aeusseren Analogie . . . von dem religioesen Begriff $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ zu dem landlauefigen rechtlichen Begriff $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ Testament ueber, verwickelt sich dabei aber in Widersprueche, die zeigen dass sein eigentliches von $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ nichts mit einem 'Testament' zu tun hat . . ."

Behm comes to the conclusion that "weder 'Bund' noch 'Testament' gibt den eigentlichen Sinn des religioesen Begriffs $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ in der griechischen Bibel wieder. $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ ist durchgehends die Verfuegung Gottes, die machtvolle Kundgebung des souverainen Willens Gottes in der Geschichte, durch die er das Verhaeltnis zwischen sich und den Menschen gemaess seiner Heilsabsicht gestaltet . . ." Cf. Torm, op. cit., p. 82.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 891. Here there is closer agreement between Behm and Cremer. "Form und Inhalt des Begriffs $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ verdankt das NT dem AT. Was zwischen AT und NT liegt, ist der Schritt von der Weissagung zur Erfuellung." Behm, op. cit., p. 137.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 583.

(4) The LXX and the New Testament stand in a relation of promise and fulfilment. The LXX bears witness to the fact that many Old Testament concepts find their point of culmination in the New Testament. (a) Take, for example, the word πίστις. The Old Testament has comparatively little to say about faith. The comprehensive Old Testament term for man's religious attitude toward God is φόβος, the fear of God.¹ Cremer maintains that "in the LXX. πίστις never signifies faith"; rather, it denotes a trait of character: trustworthiness, reliability.² Only seldom does it denote religious behaviour (I Sam. 26. 23, Jer. 5.3), and then chiefly in the sense of "fidelity or faithfulness to the covenant".³ The verb πιστεύειν appears in the Old Testament in a soteriological context. "The object and goal is . . . always salvation; in a word, faith is a Messianic conception . . ."⁴ According to Cremer, "the N. T. conception of faith follows the O. T., without, however, exactly receiving from thence its peculiar fulness and determinateness . . ."⁵ The New Testament πίστις gathers up a number of closely related Old Testament expressions: "doing His will, walking in the way of His commandments, remembering the Lord, . . . trust, hope, waiting upon the Lord . . ." In the New Testament. . . πίστις "appears as the generic name for this whole bearing."⁶ The concept is concentrated upon the present salvation, upon God's self-revelation in Christ (Jn. 3.36).⁷ ". . . The idea in this full Messianic form appears only occasionally in the O. T., but becomes pre-eminently one of the fundamental or the fundamental conception of the N. T. . . ." (b) The fear of the Lord (φόβος,⁸

1 Cremer-Koegel, p. 878.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 831. 3 Ibid., p. 481.

4 Ibid., p. 834.

5 Ibid., p. 479

6 Ibid., p. 480,

7 Cremer-Koegel, p. 900

8 Cremer, ET, p. 835.

φοβεῖσθαι), the reverential awe and dread of God's judgment often mentioned¹ in the Old Testament, no longer has a central place in the New Testament.

(c) Λειτουργία was the LXX technical term for sacerdotal service, for the official duties of the temple priesthood. "In the N. T. λειτουργεῖν λειτουργία, λειτουργός, λειτουργικός occur only in Luke's and Paul's writings, and in the Hebrews, - in all very seldom. . ."² The usage of λειτουργία in Luke 1.23 and Heb. 9.21 agrees with the LXX. The author of Hebrews links the Old Testament cultus with Christ, the High Priest of the New Testament, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκενῆς τῆς ἀληθείας. As a consequence of Christ's priestly act and in subordination to it, Paul designates himself λειτουργός Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Rom. 15.16).

In Phil. ii. 17, Paul designates the work and labour of his calling towards the Philippians as λειτουργία, - εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν - their faith is the sacrifice which he (as a priest) offers up to God On the other hand, in Phil. ii. 30 it characterizes the service rendered to the Apostle by the Philippians, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας, for it is only as the apostle regards the alms of the Philippians as a holy offering that he can speak thus of Epaphroditus, and his disregard of life for the sake of the work of Christ. And in like manner in 2 Cor. ix. 12, of the alms of the Pauline churches for the saints at Jerusalem, ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης - the ministration of this sacred service . . ."³

In the New Testament λειτουργία is not a technical term for the official duties of the ministerial office. In Acts 13.2, where we read that the προφῆται and διδάσκαλοι of the church at Antioch "ministered" to the Lord, "the reference can hardly be to the functions of these officers in the

1 Ibid., pp. 898 f. Cf. Cremer-Koegel, pp. 1116 f.: "Es ist etw. anderes an d. Stelle d. Gottesfurcht getreten, entspr. d. Wandlung, die d. Erlösung hervorgebracht hat, vgl. Roem. 8, 15, 1 Joh. 4, 18, u. so gehören φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι ebenfalls zu denjenigen Begriffen, die d. Unterschied zwischen A. u. N. T. hervortreten lassen."

2 Cremer, ET, p. 763

3 Ibid., p. 764.

Christian assemblies, but is far better understood as referring to the prayers of these persons." The work of the New Testament ministry is not simply a continuation of the functions of the Old Testament priesthood. The most suitable term for this new ministry is διακονία, "a word which of all the expressions designating service, was nearest to λειτουργεῖν, inasmuch as it signifies service for the sake of others."¹

Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism. - (1) Outside of the LXX, Cremer's chief sources of information about the religious concepts of Hellenistic Judaism were Philo and Josephus. He found that the language-moulding which had taken place in their writings was almost entirely the reverse of what he had observed in the LXX and the New Testament. Instead of letting the Old Testament concepts reshape Greek thinking, Philo and Josephus had imported² Greek ideas into Judaism. Philo in particular has sought to harmonize the

¹ Ibid., p. 763. Cf. Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 545 f.: "Es ist sehr bezeichnend, dass diese Wortreihe (λειτουργεῖν and deriv.) in der neutestamentl. Graec. nicht fuer das neutest. Amt u. seine Functionen aufgenommen worden ist," Strathman, TWNT, IV, 235, elaborates upon this same point: "Dagegen fehlt voellig die Anwendung dieser Begriffe auf die Dienste irgendwelcher leitenden Persoenlichkeiten der neuen Gemeinde und ihre 'Aemter' wie etwa Apostel, Lehrer, Propheten, Presbyter, Bischoefe usw. . . . Die Boten Christi und die leitenden Maenner der einzelnen Gemeinden haben keine λειτουργία fuer die Gemeinde zu vollziehen, sondern die ein fuer allemal geschehene λειτουργία in dem Wort vom Kreuz Christi zu verkuendigen. Bei dieser Denkweise konnte man gewiss die Bedeutung der Selbstaufopferung im Dienste Christi oder die glaubenstreue Lebenshaltung der Christen oder die Bedeutung ihrer gottesdienstlichen Gebetsversammlung mit Hilfe des vom at. lichen Priesterdienst genommenen Bildes erlaeuern: Nicht aber konnte man jene Kultusbegriffe in auszeichnender Weise auf christliche Aemter als solche verwenden. Die neue Gemeinde hatte keine Priester, weil sie aus lauter Priestern bestand." See Torm. op. cit., p. 71; Richardson, A Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 225; T. F. Torrance, Royal Priesthood, ("Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers," No. 3), pp. 15 ff.

² "Das Verhaeltnis des griechischen Ausdrucks zu den israelitischen resp. biblischen Begriffen ist vielfach das umgekehrte, wie bei den LXX. Nicht der griechische Ausdruck empfaengt neuen Inhalt, sondern der griechische Begriff wird dem biblischen aufgefropft." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., vi.

1

Old Testament with Greek philosophy. Josephus' religious vocabulary can scarcely be differentiated from that of Hellenism generally. His favourite cult-word is not ἅγιος but θεῖος. Moses is a θεῖος ἀνὴρ; the prophets are θεῖοι; the Spirit of God is a θεῖον πνεῦμα.²

(2) The thought-world of the New Testament is closer to Palestinian Rabbinic Judaism than it is to the Hellenistic Judaism of Philo and Josephus.

(a) The Apostolic preaching and instruction had to do with the Kingdom of God (Acts. 19.8), which was "explained from its connection with the entire course of the history of redemption or revelation" (Acts 28.23).³ Thus, the New Testament βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ has an Old Testament basis:

What the expression presupposes may be easily learnt from prophecies like Isa. ii. 11, lii. 7; Mic. iv.; Jer. xxiii. 7 sqq., xxx. 14 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sqq., 37; Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14, as well as from passages like Ps. xciii.-xcix. These prophecies again, are rooted (comp. Ps. xciii.-xcix.) in the relation of God to Israel, as distinguished from other nations, - a relation according to which God displays his royal authority in Israel by saving and redeeming. . . .⁴

The further development of this concept in the Intertestamental period must be considered, for the New Testament βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is directly

1 Among Koegel's additions to the Woerterbuch are some apt illustrations of the difference between the thought of Philo and that of the N. T. Philo speaks of χάρις "mit Bezug auf d. Schoepfergute Gottes u. mit Bezug auf d. natuerl. Ausstattung d. Menschen u. d. ihm innewohnenden Kraefte, Sehen, hoeren, Vernunft, wie auch Erde, Wasser, Luft, aber auch Tugenden - alles ist χάρις Wie andern ist das alles gegenueber d. χάρις im N. T. !" Cremer-Koegel, p. 1125. On Paul's use of the expression ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ (I Cor. 15.45 f.) Koegel says: "Auch d. Unterschied, ja Ggstz. zu d. Anschauung des Philo ist deutl., insofern dieser in spekulativer Ausgestaltung d. Schoepfungsberichtes Gen. 1, 27 u. 2, 7 unter d. Einfluss Platos u. seiner Ideenwelt wohl auch d. Unterschied setzt zwischen einem ersten u. zweiten Adam - . . . Bei Philo ist es mithin rein philos. Spekulation. . . ." Ibid., p. 457.

2 Cremer-Koegel, p. 491. Koegel, who added this note on Josephus' use of , got his information from a study by Schlatter, "Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?", BFTh, XIV, 1 (1909).

3 Cremer, ET, p. 133.

4 Ibid., p. 136.

related to Jewish eschatological expectations:

Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is a comprehensive N. T. expression for the object promised and expected in the plan of salvation (cf. Acts iii. 21), suggested, perhaps, primarily by Dan. ii. 44, but first used as term. techn. in Wisd. x. 10; comp. Gen. xxviii. 12; Song of the three Children, 32. . . . The N. T. expression, like αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλων, seems to have been adopted from the language of the schools and of the religious life of the community; for the formula $\text{מְלִכּוּת מְשִׁיכָּה}$ is frequently applied to the kingdom₁ of Messiah, which is also sometimes called Kingdom of God.¹

(b) Post-biblical, rabbinic language has exerted an influence in New Testament expressions like ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλων, ἐρχόμενος, ἐκεῖνος, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος . The rabbis spoke of two ages, מָדָבַר מְלִיכָה and מָדָבַר מְשִׁיכָה .² Opinion was divided as to whether the advent of the Messiah belonged to the present age or to the future age. "Finally, however, the days of Messiah are . . . separated from and placed between the two ages of the world . . ."³ In the New Testament there is an eschatological tension between

1 Ibid., p. 136. Cremer has stated that the kingdom of Messiah was equated with the $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ in rabbinic thought. According to Kuhn, TWNT, I, 573, this is incorrect. "Nirgends erscheint etwa der Gedanke, dass das Koenigreich des Messias die $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ sei, oder dass der Messias durch sein Wirken die $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ herbeifuehre oae." The Jews thought of the advent of Messiah as coming just prior to the Eschaton. The $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ is an eschatological concept; but it is not, strictly speaking, a Messianic concept.

2 Cremer illustrates this with citations from the Rabbis. E. G., Berachoth 17. 1, "the $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ has nothing in common with the $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$; in it there is neither eating nor drinking, nor marriage, nor business, nor hatred, nor want, nor wrath, but the righteous shall sit on the thrones with their crowns upon their heads, and shall delight themselves in the glory of the Shekina" (cf. Lk. 20.34-35; I Cor. 6.13). Cremer, ET, p. 621. Cf. H. Sasse, TWNT, I, 206 f.: "Die Lehre von den beiden Aionen hat das NT der juedischen Apokalyptik entlehnt. . . . Bei den Rabbinen heissen die beiden Aionen $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ dieser Aion und $\text{מְלִיכּוּת מְשִׁיכָה}$ der kommende Aion."

3 Cremer, ET, p. 77.

the αἰὼν οὗτος and the αἰὼν μέλλων .¹ (c) Certain other New Testament expressions have a rabbinic flavour about them. Ἀποσυνάγωγος , for instance, appears to be a distinctively "Jewish" word.² Ὁδός , which is a good Greek word, has acquired Hebraic, Jewish connotations in some of its New Testament usages.³

(3) Some biblical concepts were gradually weakened by post-exilic Judaism until they bore little resemblance to their Old Testament counterparts. In such cases the New Testament may discard the late Jewish usage and restore the concept to its full force and vigour.⁴

(a) An instance of this may be seen in the biblical usage of the word

1 Cremer held that "the final portion of αἰὼν οὗτος commenced when Christ appeared. . ." and that the αἰὼν μέλλων "is the new age of the world that commences with the palingenesia . . . and which is inaugurated and conditioned by the resurrection of the dead - by the second coming of Christ (Matt. xiii. and xxiv.)." ET, p. 77. But Cremer overlooks the other side of the truth. Although the full manifestation of the new age is still future, the new age is already present; the αἰὼν μέλλων has broken into the αἰὼν οὗτος . In Christ, who is the "first-fruits," the palingenesia has occurred already; the present age ended on the Cross and the new age began with the Resurrection. Cremer does not interpret Heb. 9. 26 to mean that the αἰὼν μέλλων began with the first appearance of Christ. Hence, he destroys the paradox of "having and not having" which is such an essential feature of N. T. thought. The relation between the two ages is more correctly stated by Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, trans. Floyd V. Filson (London, 1951), pp. 81 ff.; and by Sasse, TWNT, I, 207.

2 Ἀποσυνάγωγος , "banned from the synagogue," is a word which is found only in the N.T. (Jn. 9.22, 12.42, 16.2). Cremer, ET, p. 64. "This is just the sort of word that would have to be coined for use in the Jewish community." Moulton-Milligan, p. 70.

3 Mt. 7.13-14, 21.32, 22.16; Jn. 14.6; ἐγὼ εἶμι ἡ ὁδὸς . . . ; Jas. 1.8; II Pet. 2.15; cf. Is. 30.21. "Z. rechten Verstaendnis dieser Ausdrucksweise ist an d. Sprachgebr. im Judentum jener Zeit zu erinnern von 'd. beiden Wegen', Enoch 94.2, Test. 12 Patri. Asser 1: 'zwei Wege hat Gott d. Menschenkindern gegeben u. zwei Ratschluesse u. zwei Handlungen u. zwei Plaetze u. Zwei Ziele' (vgl. Bousset, Rel. d. Judentum, S. 317). Spaeter hat sich dieser gebrauch fast einem techn. ausgebildet (vgl. Apk. Bar. 85, 12. Barachot 28b. Did. 1.1. Barn. 18 usw.)." Koegel, Woerterbuch, 10th ed., pp. 777-78. Cf. the extensive article by Michaelis, TWNT, V, 42-101. See especially his exposition of Mt. 7.13 f. (pp. 71 f.) and Jn. 14.4 ff. (pp. 80 ff.).

4 Cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 24.

σοφία. In the Old Testament Wisdom Literature σοφία (חָכְמָה) stood primarily for the purposeful, creative power which governs nature and history. Wisdom is imparted to man, but it is not his possession; it remains the gift of God who is the source of all wisdom (Prov. 2.6). It is a moral power, opposed to sin. By means of it, righteousness and fear of God are effected in man (Ps. 51.8, Prov. 8.1 ff.). Wisdom came to be personified as "something objective and living, possessing an existence of her own distinct from the world and God" (Job 28.24 ff., Prov. 8.21 ff.).¹

A weakening of this conception is discernible in the Apocrypha:

. . .The seeming extension of the biblical thought to the wisdom that affirms itself in the history of redemption in Wisd. x. not only confounds it with the divine σοφία, . . . but represents it in the form of the Stoic "world-soul" (Wisd. vii. 22 sqq.), while the Son of Sirach at last comes to represent human wisdom as the most empty, selfishly-directed discretion. The august ethico-religious force of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes is weakened into an agreeable self-gratifying reflection, until at length in 4 Maccabees a definition or description appears, which savours more of the Greek or Stoic idea of φιλοσοφία than of the Scripture σοφία . . .

The New Testament does not align itself with this intellectualized, speculative type of wisdom, but "restores the true O. T. conception". In the New Testament σοφία there is a "sharpening and concentrating of the O. T. range of thought" (Mt. 11.19; Lk. 11.49; Rev. 5.12, 7.12). God's wisdom is made manifest in "His saving purposes accomplished in Christ, and carried into effect in His Church" (I Cor. 1.24, 2.7; Eph. 3.10).³

(b) The New Testament *πνεύματι* affords a good illustration of the way in which the Apostolic kerygma penetrates through the degenerate theological concepts of late Judaism and re-establishes contact with the Old Testament. In

1 Cremer, ET, pp. 870 f.

2 Ibid., p. 872.

3 Ibid., p. 872 f.

the Apocrypha the expectation and hope expressed by the verb πιστεύειν are no longer directed toward specific redemptive events. Faith has been generalized into a diffuse, universal trust. Formerly Israel had known the God of her redemption through the history which she had experienced and was yet to experience, but now, due to the influence of Greek philosophy, knowledge of God was sought in nature and its laws.¹ "The N.T. πιστεύειν," however, "connects itself not with the Apocrypha, but with the O.T., wherein the Messianic form of the idea is prominent, and the reference is always to God's revelation in Christ."²

(4) While Cremer had sound theological reasons for wishing to connect New Testament concepts with their point of origin in the Old Testament, he was inclined to underestimate the importance of the intervening history.³ The New Testament does not repudiate every religious development which took place in the Intertestamental period. The New Testament conception of angels must surely have some connection, however slight, with the Jewish angelology which grew up during and after the Exile. Yet Cremer, in his article on ἄγγελος in the

1 Cremer-Koegel, p. 898.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 835.

3 Schlatter's studies in Rabbinic Judaism have a special significance in this regard. He wrote in his memoirs: "Von Anfang an ging mein Verlangen auf die Erkenntnis der Wege, die von der Judenschaft zur neutestamentlichen Gemeinde fuhren . . . Das Judentum, mit dem das Neue Testament in fruchtbarer Gemeinschaft und heissem Kampf stand, . . . das palaestinische, das pharasaäische, das ich in seinen eigenen Zeugnissen hoeren wollte. . . . Der Blick auf Cremers grosse Arbeit, sein neutestamentliches Woerterbuch, belebte diese Plaene. Neben das Alte Testament in seiner griechischen Gestalt stellte er das neutestamentliche Wort. Ich empfand hier ein Luecke; wo blieb die mit dem Neuen Testament zeitgenoessische Gemeinde, ihr lebende Sprache, ihr ihre Gegenwart fuellendes Erlebnis? Blieb dieser Teil der Geschichte verhuellt, so wurde ein wichtiger Bestandteil der neutestamentlichen Sprach- und Denkgeschichte, der Uebergang aus dem Semitismus in den Hellenismus, unerkennbar. Hier hatte das Sehfeld Cremers eine Grenze, die ihn der Mitarbeit anderer beduerftig machte. Munter sprang ich in die Arbeit hinein." Die Entstehung der Beitrage zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie und ihr Zusammenhang mit meiner theologischen Arbeit, BFTb, XXV, 1 (1920), pp. 75 ff.

1
Woerterbuch says nothing whatever about Post-Exilic Jewish angelology.

Similarly, in his article on Δαίμων he has not made sufficient study of the demonology of Palestinian Judaism in relation to the demons and unclean spirits of the New Testament.

2
Hellenistic Religious Terminology. - - We saw earlier how the LXX and the New Testament tended to avoid words with strong associations in pagan religious usage. This was not always the case, however. Sometimes the New

1 Cremer has partially supplied this lack in his article "Engel," PRE, 372 ff. Here he devotes some attention to the angelology of Jewish apocalyptic. He notes the development that has taken place in the Book of Daniel (10.13, 12.1): ". . . dass Engel Namen erhalten, weist zurueck auf babylonischen Einfluesse . . ." This new angelology, which has come into being through contact with Babylonian and Persian conceptions, enlarges upon, but does not contradict, earlier O. T. views. "Die apokalyptische Symbolik findet sich unter den neutest. Schriften nur in der Apokalypse wieder, vgl. Apk. 12,7 ff.; Ju. 9. Die Engelperscheinungen in der neutestamentlichen Geschichte gehen nicht ueber den Rahmen der Engelperscheinungen in der alttestamentlichen Gesch. hinaus . . ." According to Cremer, a late Jewish angelology like that of the Talmud and Pseudepigrapha is not to be found in the N.T. Such conceptions are faithless superstition. "Etwas anders als den alttestamentlichen Ausgangspunkt hat die neutestamentliche Verkeundung mit ihnen nicht gemein."

In the article on ἄγγελοι in TWNT (I, 72-86) Grundmann, von Rad, and Kittel make no such extreme statement, yet they do not really refute Cremer. They concede that the origin of the post-biblical Jewish angelology remains somewhat of a mystery. It is still an open question whether this later angelology has influenced the N. T. to any large extent.

2 Cremer has sketched the history of this interesting word in its broad outlines. See ET, pp. 169 ff. and Cremer-Koegel, pp. 270 ff. Δαίμων originally meant the power of the godhead and was almost synonymous with θεός. To the Tragedians it meant Fate, an inexorable, impersonal power. In the Hellenistic Period this concept was personalized through Oriental influence. Philo and Josephus tried to equate the angels of the O. T. with the heroes and demons of Greek mythology. In Hellenistic Judaism the demons were connected with the ancient pagan gods of the O. T. E.g., "Beelzebul," Mk. 3.22, may have been identified with Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, II K. 1.2 ff. We encounter a Jewish demonology in the N. T., but there is no dualism between good and evil spirits. Christ has power over all unclean spirits (Mt. 12.29, Mk. 1.34). Cf. Foerster, TWNT, II, 1-20. He has made an excellent study of Graeco-Hellenistic demonology and of the conceptions of demons found in rabbinic literature and Jewish apocalyptic.

Testament writers deliberately chose words which had a well-known meaning in the Graeco-Roman world; but when these Hellenistic words appear in the New Testament they have a new content. Cremer has not provided any good examples of this aspect of the language-moulding process. While his studies in classical Greek and the LXX are of permanent value, he has not taken sufficient account of the religious concepts of the later Hellenistic period. Julius Koegel, in his revised 10th edition of the Woerterbuch, has applied Cremer's comparative method to the new material from the papyri and the Hellenistic Mystery Religions. The results show that the New Testament stands fully as much in antithesis to its Hellenistic environment as it does to the spirit of Greek classicism. A number of Hellenistic technical terms do appear in the New Testament, but there is no proof that these words are used in their pagan sense. Indeed, the evidence points in quite another direction. Let us take some examples.

(a) In the Hellenistic period the pagan gods of Egypt were called κύριοι. Then in the Roman cult of emperor worship the term was applied to the Caesars. When the Early Church confessed Christ as κύριος, this may have¹ been a conscious protest against the absolute claims of the Roman emperor. In addition, the word had acquired certain biblical associations through the fact that the LXX used it to translate יהוה.² (b) When the New Testament writers

1 Cremer-Koegel, p. 651

2 The N. T. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός = κύριος is not the same as the O. T. יהוה = κύριος, but there is a relationship between the two expressions nonetheless. See Cremer, ET, p. 382 f. K. L. Schmidt rightly says that "was im AT von dem κύριος יהוה gesagt wird, das wird im NT von dem κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός gesagt." TWNT, III, 501. (Cf. Zeph 3.9 and I Cor. 1.2).

spoke of Christ as σωτήρ (Lk. 2.11, Jn. 4.42, Acts 13.23), they were using a word familiar to the Hellenistic world. This too was a term applied to the Roman emperor. In the New Testament, however, σωτήρ has an Old Testament background, and its Messianic connotations are realized in Christ. ¹ (c)

Even words like γνῶσις have undergone a change in meaning in the New Testament through association with Old Testament concepts and through a concrete application to Jesus Christ. In Gnostic thought γνῶσις was a semi-personal σύναφαις, the mediator of σωτηρία. This σωτηρία was a mystical union with God which led to deification and transfiguration. Paul's language in I Corinthians may appear to have some affinities with Gnosticism, but in reality Paul is using Gnostic language to combat Gnostic ideas. ² (d) The same applies to Paul's use of the term πλῆρως in Ephesians and Colossians. ³

1 The N. T. writers must have realized that "dieselbe Bez. u. Ehrung d. Caesar zugesprochen wurde wie sie auch ihr Messias trug; u. sie werden darum diese noch mit ganz anderer Emphase verwendet haben, teilweise vielleicht auch mit Absicht in d. gleichen Verbindungen, die sie dort vorfanden. Nur ist damit nichts ueber d. Uebergang d. Bez. ausgesagt. Diese ist doch wohl hinreichend aus d. AT u. aus d. Heb. erkl." Cremer-Koegel, p. 1035.

2 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 243 ff. Koegel believed that Paul's concept of knowledge might have been influenced by the Hebrew נֵת. Bultmann has detected a Hebraic thought-mode in I Cor. 8. "True gnosis is not something achieved by man, but has its root in God's knowledge of man (note the startling substitution of the Passive for the Active in ver. 3)." Here Paul is clearly dependent on the O. T. Cf. Gal. 4.9. "'To be known by God' can mean nothing but what is elsewhere called election or calling." "Gnosis," Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, trans. J. R. Coates (London, 1952), p. 43.

For Paul, God is not the object of mere speculation. "So Phil. 3,10, nicht um d. spekulative Erkenntnis, sondern d. persoennl. Bekanntschaft mit Christus handle Der Erkenntnis setzt durch sich selbst ein Verhaeltnis, das d. Bedeutung d. Erkenntnisobj. entspricht." Cremer-Koegel, pp. 243, 247.

3 In d. gnostischen Kreisen hat ja d. terminus πλῆρως u. Dvv. seine ganz bestimmte Auspraegung erhalten. . . . D. Irrlehren in diesen Gemeinden Ephesus, Colossae haengen damit zusammen; Paulus bekaempft sie gleichsam mit ihren eigenen Waffen. D. Unterschied, ja Ggatz. der sich damit verbindenden Anschauung laesst sich natuerlich nicht in einzeln nachweisen; er ist mit d. Ggatz. d. Gesamtanschauung gegeben, bes. in dem, was dem Ap. Christus ist." Cremer-Koegel, p. 926.

Post-Biblical Greek. - - A comparison of the language of the New Testament with that of the Greek Fathers will show that certain significant changes have taken place. These changes mark the transition from the Primitive Church to Early Catholicism. The beginnings of this transition can already be detected in the language of the Pastoral Epistles. Cremer regretted that, due to the lack of sufficient helps, he had been unable to make a thorough study of ecclesiastical Greek. He has, however, left us one or two word studies which illustrate the difference between biblical thought and patristic thought. His investigation of the history of the word $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$ may be cited as an example. In Hellenistic Greek $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$ commonly meant a command or decree. It occurs in this sense in the New Testament (Lk. 2.1; Acts 17.7; Eph. 2.15; Col. 2.14, 20). With the Greek philosophers $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$ was a technical term meaning opinion, view, doctrinal statement. The Stoics spoke of basic principles, universally valid truths which they called $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. No trace of this technical, philosophical usage is to be found in the New Testament, but it occurs frequently in the Fathers, where we find expressions like $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$, $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$, $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. Here we see evidence of what Oscar Cullmann has called "the Hellenizing transformation of Christianity".

In recent years scholars have been devoting more attention to the

1 Cremer, ET, v.

2 "Die griechischen Vaeter der ersten Jahrhunderte entsprechend ihrer eigentuemlichen Auffassung des Christentums als der wahren Philosophie den Ausdruck von dem philosophischen auf das religioese Gebiet verpflanzten." Cremer, Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, hrsg. Otto Zoeckler (Noerdlingen, 1884) II, 608. Cf. Cremer, ET, p. 206.

3 Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 57 ff.: "Wherever in the course of doctrinal development there has occurred a debate between Hellenism and Christianity, it has always had its fundamental outcome in . . . the Hellenizing of Christianity."

development which leads from the New Testament to the Early Catholic Church.¹
 Investigations have shown that the theological language of the Greek and Latin
 Fathers no longer displays that resistance to Hellenistic modes of thought
 which was such a distinctive feature of the biblical language.² With the rise
 of catholicism words like ἐκκλησία occur with increasing frequency, and the
 word λειτουργός appears again in a sacerdotal sense.³ The Jewish temple
 service and the Hellenistic cults are replaced by the Christian cult.

1 We may cite, for example, the notable work done in this field by K. L. Schmidt. See his articles on βασιλεία, TWNT, I, 593 ff.; and ἐκκλησία, ibid., III, 535 ff. (Eng. tr., "The Church, Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, J. R. Coates, ed. London, 1950, pp. 62 ff.).

2 Kittel, op. cit., p. 30: "Certain currents or streams, which were either stopped or stemmed by the New Testament, break forth again in the first centuries of the Church's life. This we can illustrate from the use of ἱερεῖς in Hermas, of ἑπισκοπία in Ignatius, of ἐπίσκοπος in Origen, and of ἐκκλησία in the Eastern Church and Monachism."

3 Torm, op. cit., pp. 70 f. Cf. Oliver Chase Quick, The Gospel of Divine Action (London, 1933), p. 109: "Thus the most recent developments in Christian thought and study take us right back behind that union of Catholic theology with Hellenic philosophy which has dominated the theology of the Christian Church down the centuries . . ."

CHAPTER II

BASIC FACTORS IN THE FORMATION OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

The Hebraic Background

After perusing a cross-section of the material in Cremer's Woerterbuch, one has the distinct impression that there is a pattern of meaning in the New Testament which links itself with the Old Testament time and time again. This is not merely a question of external Hebraisms. Cremer has made it abundantly clear that Hebraic concepts lie at the very heart of New Testament theological thought. In this, as in so many other respects, he has carried forward the work begun by Tholuck.¹ Tholuck had observed that most commentators neglected the origin and history of New Testament concepts. They gave a one-sided view, and failed to find "the true point of union" in which diverse concepts attained a comprehensive wholeness and oneness. "Since the time of Semler, however," he declared, "exegesis has been led more to take into consideration the Old Testament and Jewish point of connection with New Testament ideas." He listed some concepts which needed to be understood in relation to their Old Testament background: Kingdom of God, world, Christ, Antichrist, flesh, spirit, Son of Man, Son of God. Hence, "the lexicographer

1 See Tholuck's essays, "Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament," The Biblical Cabinet, Vol. II (Edinburgh 1833), pp. 191 ff.; and "The Old Testament in the New Testament," A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Vol. II (Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 181 ff.

Tholuck was not the first to perceive a Semitic background in the N. T. Luther wrote: "Ohne die ebraeische Sprache kann mann die heil. Schrift nimmermehr recht verstehen. Denn das neue Testament, obs wol griechisch geschrieben ist, doch ist es voll von Ebraismus und ebraeischer Art zu reden." Luther's Tischreden, W. A. I, 525. Quoted by Torm, op. cit., p. 40. Bucer, In sacra quatuor euagelia, enarrationes perpetuae (edition of 1553), gave the Hebrew equivalents for many N. T. terms. So did Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Clavis scripturae sacrae, editio nova (Basel, 1629): Christus, pp. 116 ff.; Foedus, pp. 343 ff.; Pax, pp. 861 ff.; Sanctus, pp. 1097 ff.; Verbum, pp. 1278 ff.

of the New Testament has . . . first of all to make the Old Testament ideas the object of his research. . . ."¹

In his earliest work, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Cremer² made the Old Testament the starting-point for his exegesis. And in the preface to the third edition of the Woerterbuch he declared that the concepts with which the New Testament writers reckon rest for the most part upon Old Testament foundations.³ In recent years the rediscovery of Hebraic modes of

1 Tholuck, "Lexicography of the New Testament," trans. Edward Robinson. Biblical Repository, I (1831), p. 564; and Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, p. 76.

2 Commenting on Mt. 23.39 Cremer says: ". . . dies ist nach dem Grundgedanken der alttestamentlichen Weissagung die Ausfuehrung eines sichtbaren Gottes-Staates, in welchem sich alle nationalen wie religioesen Hoffnungen Israels zu Israels Trost verwirklichen wuerden. Vergleichen wir heizu Mal. 3,1., sowie die Hoffnung auf einen seinem Zweck entsprechenden Tempel der messianischen Zeit, Ez. 40 u.a. St., so berechtigt uns diese alttestamentliche Grundlage noch mehr zu der vorhin behaupteten Fassung des V. 38." Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Matth. 24,25, (Stuttgart, 1860), pp. 4 f.

To understand the meaning of παλιγγενεσία in Mt. 19.28 "es genuegt nicht, sich auf Philo zu berufen, . . . denn auch wuerde man noch die juedische, resp. alttestamentliche Grundlage aufsuchen muessen. Matth. 19,28. ist wol zunaechst von der 'grossen Auferstehung des Volkes Gottes' wie sie Ezechiel Cap. 37 im Gesicht schaute, die Rede . . . Israels Erloesung und Wiederherstellung ist eben nach Ez. 37. vgl. 36,26. 27. eine Neubelebung. Bis dahin ist das Volk in Schmerzen, wie ein Weib in Kindes Noethen." Ibid., p. 35.

On Mt. 24.36: "Wie V. 35. eine alttestamentliche Beziehung unter neutestamentlichem Ausdruck uns vurfuehrte, so auch V. 36., und zwar das Wort Sach. 14, 7.: Es wird ein Tag seyn, der dem Herrn bekannt ist; dort ist hier der Vater Jesu Christi." Ibid., p. 133.

3 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., v. Schleiermacher, too, was aware of the historical connection between O. T. and N. T. concepts, for he declared: "Unleugbar aber ist dass der Einfluss des hebraeischen bei den eigentlich religioesen Terminum vorzueglich gross ist." Hermeneutik und Kritik, p. 57. Yet he failed to see the theological significance of this continuity. "Indem er das AT lediglich fuer eine Urkunde des Judentums und seiner 'mosaischen Institutionen' hielt, ohne die Eigenart der prophetischen Botschaft zu erfassen, sah er das Christentum im gleichen Verhaeltniss zu Judentum und Heidentum, was sein geschichtliches Dasein und seine Abzweckung betrifft." Wehrung, RGG, II, 1757. "Schleiermachers 'Marcionitismus' war wohl von Einfluss auf die Scheidung der Arbeit am NT von der Arbeit am AT und auf das Vorlauefige Zurueckbleiben der letzten, sehr zum Nachteile der ersten." Kaehler, PRE, III, 192 f.

thinking has had a very beneficial effect upon the interpretation of both Old and New Testaments. These investigations of Hebrew thought-categories have been accompanied by a return to theological exegesis. It is evident that, in this respect, Cremer was ahead of his time. While we must allow for the obvious limitations in his work - his knowledge of Hebrew psychology was very elementary; he was not an Old Testament specialist; his task was to write a lexicon of the New Testament - the remarkable fact is that he had found a line of approach which was basically correct. He seems to have had an instinctive, if somewhat rudimentary, grasp of Hebraic thought-modes.

It is now generally recognized that the ancient Semites did not think analytically, but synthetically; they saw the part in relation to a larger whole.¹ Those who are familiar with the current literature on this subject will not find anything essentially new in Cremer's lexicon, but they will see that it anticipates the direction taken by the more recent conceptual-historical² research, and that it actually contains many supposedly new discoveries.

In his Woerterbuch Cremer has pointed out numerous instances where Hebraic thought-modes have permeated the New Testament. Later Jewish thought was

1 Aubrey R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (Cardiff, 1949), p. 1.

2 Cremer's Woerterbuch corroborates statements like these: "The O. T. is the foundation of the New. The message of the N. T. is in the Hebrew tradition. Our tutors to Christ are Moses and the prophets, and not Plato and the Academics." Norman H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London, 1944), p. 159.

"If Christians would acquire an adequate understanding of the thought forms of the N. T., or of the foundations of Christian theology, it is with the O. T. that they must begin. . . . The vast majority of Christianity's technical terms are of O. T. origin. . . . The O. T. and Christianity are inextricably woven together." H. F. D. Sparks, The Old Testament in the Christian Church (London, 1944), pp. 93, 101.

influenced by Persian and Hellenistic elements, probably to a greater degree than Cremer was willing to admit; but this fact notwithstanding, the thought modes of the New Testament are based upon a Jewish theology, cosmology, and anthropology which may be traced directly to the Old Testament.

Theological thought-forms. - - The idea that the Word of God has creative power, that God brought the heavens and the earth into being by an act of speech, has Semitic origins which antedate the Greek concept of the λόγος. The antithesis between light and darkness, which is such a prominent feature of the Fourth Gospel, need not be ascribed to Persian or Gnostic sources. Light was a symbol for life in Israelite thinking from a very early period.¹ When expressions like "name", "face", "glory", are applied to Christ or to God the Father in the New Testament, they should be understood in their Semitic context. In Hebraic thinking, to "behold the face" of God means to be in His immediate presence, to have direct access to Him, to have communion with Him (Mt. 18.10, Heb. 9.24, Rev. 22.4). To the Hebrew, God was wholly present in each of His actions, in each attribute, in each self-manifestation.²

1 In the O. T. אור was sometimes a figurative expression for prosperity and well-being (Job 18.5-6, 18). Note the close connection between light and life in Job 3.16, 20; Ps. 49.19; 97.11. "Bez. ist nun אור. φῶς ist denn Licht d. Obj. d. Heilsverheissung." Is. 9.1, 42.6. In the N. T., in the Johannine writings, the light-image has this soteriological meaning. "Das Licht Unseligkeit u. Suende ausschliesst." Jn. 1.4, 3.19, 8.12, I Jn. 1.5. Cremer-Koegel, p. 1105.

2 See Tholuck's discussion of אור כבוד אלהים. He notes the peculiarly Hebraic character of these concepts. In later Judaism these tended to become hypostatizations of God as He manifested Himself to men. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, trans. C. P. Krauth (Edinburgh, 1860), pp. 57 ff., 68. Cf. G. A. F. Knight, A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, ("Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers," No. 1, Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 12-16. Although a century has elapsed since Tholuck wrote his commentary, his conclusions and Knight's are strikingly similar.

Cremer calls attention to the fact that in the Old Testament God was designated as the living God, the One who actively accomplishes His will and purpose in redemption (יְהוָה; Josh. 3.10; Hos. 2.1; Ps. 42.2, 84.2).¹

Corresponding to this is the New Testament expression θεὸς ζῶν (Mt. 16.16, Acts 14.15, Rom. 9.26, II Cor. 3.3, et al.). "In like manner the designation of Christ as the Living One, ὁ ζῶν, Luke xxiv. 5, Rev. i. 18, not only with reference to His resurrection, but to the reality of His life, over which death and corruption could have no power, cf. Rom. vi. 9; John vi. 57, xvi. 19; Heb. vii. 8, 25."²

In Hebrew thought "the name is a sign or mark of him who bears it; it describes what is, or is said to be, characteristic of the man . . . it expresses what he is for another . . . it is an account of his relationship to others".³ When this concept of the name is applied to God, the consequences are far-reaching. "In His name God manifests Himself to men (Gen. xvi.13), . . . and where God's glory is manifest, His name is said to be there."⁴ New Testament expressions like εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (Mt. 18.20, Jn. 1.12, et. al.) and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (Jn. 20.31) are in keeping with this mode of thought. An act done "in the name" of Christ is done in the sphere in which Christ Himself is present and active:

We must ever remember that what Christ is lies not only in His name, but is said to be present to us in the name when-

1 Cremer, ET, p. 270. "D. Beziehung Gottes als d. Lebenden, Lebendigen . . . ist nicht etwa bloss nachdrueckl. Behauptung d. Existenz, sondern betont d. Wahrheit u. Wirklichkeit d. Gottes d. Offenbarung . . . D. lebendige Gott ist d. handelnde, sich betaetigende Gott, von dem d. Durchfuehrung seines Willens u. seiner Absichten auf d. Gebiet der Heilsoekonomie sowie d. wiederstrebenden Elementen gegenueber, also auf d. Gebiet d. Geschichte erwartet werden kann . . . D. lebendige Gott ist d. Gott, der mit d. Menschen u. fuer sie lebt u. geschichtl. handelt." Cremer-Koegel, p. 470.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 271.

3 Ibid., pp. 454 f.

4 Cremer, ET, p. 455.



ever we use it . . . To baptize "in the name of," etc., means to baptize into that which the person named is for the baptized; and therefore it is not merely a designation of the person in whose name the rite is celebrated, but a full designation of his character and relationship.¹

In the Old Testament the name of God and the glory of God are closely-related concepts:

The δόξα of God coincides with His self-revelation, Ex. xxxiii. 22, . . . in it as the form of His self-manifestation, God sets Himself forth, since it comprises all that He is for us, for our good . . . This redemptive character is an essential element of the idea of δόξα, so that one might perhaps say - the δόξα of God, as it is the fulness of all that is good in Him ('Ιησὺς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς, Ex. xxxiii. 19), all His redeeming attributes (cf. παντοκράτωρ, John i. 14, 16), so also is it the form in which He reveals Himself in the economy of salvation . . .²

Against this background we may interpret the Johannine passages which speak of Christ's glory (Jn. 1.14, 2.11, 12.28, 13.3, 17.1, et al.). In Christ "God manifests all the goodness that He is". Christ's glory is "an act of God His Father in Him".³

Cosmological thought-forms. - - Certain features of the New Testament cosmology are reminiscent of the ancient Semitic conception of the universe in which the earth was pictured as flat and entirely surrounded by water. The firmament, which was shaped like a great bowl, held back the waters above the earth. The terrestrial seas were connected with the waste of waters under the earth (Gen. 1.6 ff., 7.11b; Ex. 20.4). This conception underlies passages like these:⁴

ὁ ποιησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, Acts 4.24
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, Phil. 2.10
ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς, Rev. 5.13

1 Ibid., p. 455 f.

2 Ibid., p. 208.

3 Ibid., p. 211. Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1954), p. 95

4 Cremer, ET, pp. 152, 465.

The primeval ocean of chaos, $\text{LXX } \lambda\beta\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, was a symbol for the radical evil hostile to God and His creation, and was closely associated with death and Sheol (Job 38.16-17; Ezek. 31.15; Jonah 2.2b-6; cf. Luke 8.31; Rom. 10.7; Rev. 9.1-2, 11).¹ Sheol, the abode of the dead, was located somewhere beneath the earth. To translate the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל the LXX borrowed the Greek word ᾠδης . Cremer notes that the word ᾠδης , "ruin or destruction", occurs in some passages of the O. T. in close connection with Hades and thus serves to denote the state after death; Prov. xv. 11, ᾠδης καὶ ᾠδης .² Concerning the state after death as it is depicted in the Old Testament Cremer says:

In the realm of the dead . . . it becomes manifest what death is, viz. . . . separation and removal from God, the source of life, from God whose place of making revelation is the earth and not Hades, whose abode is heaven and not Hades. . . . In Hades the whole world-history comes together. It is the rendezvous of history come to a stand-still in the midst of its movement - family history, national history, world history, and each new arrival completes the missing members. . . . The Old Testament view of one realm of the dead for all is a sublime testimony to the universal sinfulness of the human race.³

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 67 ff., 451 ff. Cremer has not worked this out in any detail, but subsequent studies have shown that the ocean had a symbolic theological significance in ancient Israel. So did the desert. "Indeed in three passages the wilderness is described by the word *tohu* . . ." (Deut. 32.10, Job 6.18, Ps. 107.40), the same word used to describe the primeval chaos in Gen. 1.2. E. C. Rust, *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought* (London, 1953), p. 27. God's dividing of the waters at creation could be likened to His dividing of the Red Sea at the Exodus (Ps. 89.9 ff.; 136.6, 13; Is. 51.9b-10). When God's people are under judgment, chaos comes again; when God redeems his people, the chaos is conquered. God's redemptive act is an act of creation. Images involving water are especially prominent in those portions of the O. T. which have a priestly background. The brazen sea in Solomon's temple may have represented the primeval ocean (I K. 7.23 ff.). *Ibid.*, pp. 29 ff. The sea image appears again in the Book of Revelation (4.6, 13.1). There is no sea in the new heaven and the new earth (Rev. 21.1).

2 Cremer, ET, p. 453.

3 Cremer, *Beyond the Grave*, trans. Samuel T. Lowrie, (New York, 1886), pp. 30, 33, 41.

These ideas still linger in the New Testament (see, e. g., Rev. 20. 13-14). Mt. 11.23 is reminiscent of Is. 14.11-12 and Ezek. 32.27.¹

In view of the fact that the Hebrews tended to think in terms of the whole it is somewhat surprising that they had no single word to denote the universe in its entirety, but referred to it as אֲרֶץ וְשָׁמַיִם (LXX $\delta\ \sigma\acute{o}\varsigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός ; Gen. 1.1; Prov. 25.3; Is. 55.9). There is no exact Hebrew equivalent for the Greek word $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. The New Testament adopts this concept of a two-part universe (Mt. 6.10, 11.25; Mk. 13.31; Acts 14.15; Eph. 1.10; et al.).

. . . an antithetic relationship readily suggests itself between earth and heaven, not only in a natural, but also in a moral respect, seeing that the heaven is not only more exalted than the earth (Ps. ciii. 11; cf. John xii. 32; Acts vii. 49), but also answers to its purpose, as the fit dwelling-place of God. Thus with earth is associated, according to the connection, the idea of emptiness, of weakness, of what does not correspond with the wisdom and power of God, of what is sinful.²

The Hebrews were not pantheists; they did not confuse God with the world. Nor did they regard the separation between heaven and earth as an antithesis between the infinite and the finite, the eternal and the temporal. It was man's sin, and not his creatureliness, which separated him from God. In the New Testament "the earth is the sphere of the $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, διὼν οὕτως "; and this $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ is not the harmonious order of the Greeks; it is the fallen world into which sin and death have entered.³ This world is passing away, not because

1 Cremer, ET, p. 68.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 152. "D. Grund dafuer, dass sich in der bibl. Ausdrucksweise einen entspr. einheitl. Bez. d. Weltganzen nicht findet, kann nur in d. rel. Unterscheidung, bzw. in d. Zerissenheit d. Verhaeltnisses zwischen Himmel u. Erde liegen." Cremer-Koegel, p. 620.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 152. Cf. Torm, op. cit., p. 65; "Das Weltall ist nicht mehr ein harmonisches Universum; denn die Suende hat alles in ihm befleckt;

of a natural law of mutability, but because it stands under God's judgment. Redemption must come in the form of a wholly new creation. Both in the Old Testament and in the New, cosmology is bound up with soteriology. The book of Revelation describes the new creation in characteristically Hebraic fashion as the new heaven and the new earth (Rev. 21.1; cf. II Cor. 5.17). In the new creation the "moral" antithesis, the contradiction between heaven and earth due to man's sin, will be done away:

Then at once all struggling and sighing of the creation has an end. . . . and the Lord redeems His word, "Behold, I make all things new." Then the separation between heaven . . . and earth, that has continued till then will cease to exist. The earth will no longer stand in a position between the realm of death and heaven; but heaven and earth will again constitute a connected whole, and the tabernacle, the sanctuary of God, will be with the children of men.¹

Anthropological thought-forms. - Since Cremer's time, much progress² has been made in the study of Hebrew psychology. His presentation of the biblical concept of man lacks historical differentiation; it is neither comprehensive enough nor exact enough. But his knowledge was sufficient to enable him to show that behind the New Testament terminology employed to describe the nature of man (σῶμα, ψύχη, καρδιά, πνεῦμα, σὰρξ) there are Hebraic thought

boese Mächte herrschen; sie sind κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. 6,12, und der Teufel selbst ist ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (Joh. 12, 31 u.a.). Der ganze κόσμος liegt im Argen, 1. Joh. 5,19."

1 Cremer, Beyond the Grave, p.80.

2 Among the important works in this field are: Johs. Pedersen, Israel, its Life and Culture, I-II (1926), III-IV (1940); Walther Eichrodt, Das Menschenverstaendnis des alten Testaments (1944) E. T., Man in the Old Testament (1951), and Theologie des Alten Testaments (1933 ff.); Aubrey R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (1949); to name only a few.

categories. He noted that while Greek thinkers considered the soul ($\psi\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$) to be the essential and immortal part of man as opposed to the body ($\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$). the biblical writers attached very great importance to the fact that man exists in bodily form.

It is essential to the right understanding of Scripture language and thought firmly to maintain the significance of man's body as a necessary and constituent part of human nature. . . .¹ Redemption is restoration of life, and of everything that belongs to life. . . . While the superficial hope of the soul's immortality, in pointed contrast with materialism, really degrades the body to a prison of the soul, not even the most zealous materialism can ascribe greater significance to the body than the Holy Scripture does. . . . Without body, no life.²

Among the Greeks " $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}$ " came to denote the morally endowed individuality of man which continues after death, - which corresponds with the pantheistic theory that the soul (Aristotle, de anima, 1. 5.) is part of the $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\nu$, which, borne upon the winds, enters the breathing man, and that the body is a prison-house wherein the soul is incarcerated on account of its

1 Cremer, ET, p. 536.

2 Cremer, Beyond the Grave, pp. 16, 19, 20.

"Ueberhaupt ist fuer d. Verstaendnis d. bibl. Sprache u. Gedanken unterschieden d. Notwendigkeit u. Bedeutung d. Leibes fuer d. Bestand d. menschl. Wesens festzuhalten, gerade im Ggatz. zu d. griech. Denken. D. Leib ist nicht d. Gefaengnis d. Seele Im Grunde ist auch fuer Jesus die Zusammengehorigkeit beider u. bes. d. Bedeutung d. Leibes fuer d. Ganze d. menschl. Wesens so gross, dass in Kraft d. Einwohnung d. Geistes d. goettlichen Heilsgegenwart auch eine Restitution d. Leibes in d. Auferstehung stattfindet Denn es ist schliessl. d. Person Jesus selbst in ihrer sinnl.-irdischen Erscheinung u. in ihrem geschichtl. Dasein unter d. Begriff d. $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ zusammengefasst." (Cremer reminds us that Christ came $\epsilon\nu \acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\mu\alpha\tau\iota \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$.) "Dieser ist es vermoege dessen Christus als Opfer fuer uns eintreten kann, indem er dadurch uns gehoert u. teilhaft an uns u. an dem, was unser ist, - u. eben diese Tatsache ist es, vermoege deren wir mit ihm in Verbindung kommen." Cremer-Koegel, pp. 1038-40.

former sins, etc."¹ The New Testament usage of $\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$, however, has nothing to do with this concept, but derives its meaning from the Hebrew $\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$. In the Old Testament $\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$ means "life, breath, the life which exists in every living thing, therefore life in distinct individuality" (Gen. 1.30, 2.7, 19). This $\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$ "exists only where there is an individual life with material organization". The $\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$ is said to possess $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ ² the life-giving power imparted by God to all creatures. This $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ is common to both men and animals (Ps. 104.29, 30; Eccles. 3.19-20) "but, nevertheless, man is distinct, Gen. 1.20 . . . for he has life . . . by virtue of a special immediate communication; and thus the $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ in him, as the divine life-principle, is at the same time the principle of that God-related and therefore morally determined life which is peculiar to him (cf. Gen. 1.26,27 with Eph. iv. 24, Col. 1.11. 10)."³

Man's spirit ($\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$) is the life-principal, his soul ($\psi\chi\acute{\alpha}$) the subject, and his heart ($\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha$) the seat and organ of his existence. "From this inter-penetrating relationship may be explained the varied parallelisms between these expressions."⁴ The Israelite regarded the life-principle in him as God's gift, but did not confuse it with God's own Spirit (Is. 42.5, Ps. 104; 29-30).⁵ In the New Testament, God's Spirit is communicated to man and works in him as the new life-principle. God's Spirit comes in contact with man's spirit but "does not become identical with the spirit belonging to man by nature, nor does it supplant it".⁶ Man's spirit and soul have their immediate organ in the

1 Cremer, ET, p. 583. 2 Ibid., p. 583. 3 Ibid., p. 505.

4 Cremer, ET, p. 505. 5 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 939 ff. 6 Cremer, ET, p. 508.

heart which the Hebrews regarded as the center of all feeling, thinking,¹ willing, and acting. Reflective thinking is still included among the functions attributed to the heart in the New Testament (Mt. 9.4; Rom. 10.6,8; Rev. 18.7). The heart is "the point in which the entire personal life is concentrated". It is the seat of the emotions "which, as such, lay claim to the whole man" (Jn. 14.1, 16.22; Rom. 9.2). It is the organ for the "reception and conception of the Word of God and the operations of grace" (Mt. 13.19; Acts 2.37, 7.51; Rom. 5.5; II Cor. 4.6).² The Apostle Paul must surely have been thinking in Hebraic terms when he wrote: "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Thess. 5.23).

While the Greek antithesis between body ($\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$) and soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) has no place in the New Testament, we do find there a very powerful antithesis between flesh ($\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$) and spirit ($\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$). The latter antithesis, whose origins are to be found in the Old Testament, is due to the contradiction³ caused by human sin. The meaning of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ in the New Testament is controlled largely by the Hebrew גוֹשׁוֹל (LXX $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$, $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$). Cremer defines $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ as follows:

1 Cremer, ET, pp. 347 ff. Cf. von Zezschwitz, op. cit., p. 50: "Alle Functionen geistiger Thaetigkeit werden auf das Herz zurueckgefuehrt, nicht nur die Gefuehle und Affekte, sondern ebenso Wille, ja Denkhthaetigkeit." This was true also of earlier, more primitive Greek thought, but later, $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ referred only to the emotions, while $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ denoted mind, reflective thinking. Cremer, ET, pp. 343, 437.

2 Ibid., p. 349.

3 "D. $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ bot wohl als Organ d. Sinnlichkeit d. Anknuepfungspunkt fuer d. Suende dar, aber sie war nicht originaliter suendig bestimmt; . . . das ist nicht in d. Wesen d. $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$ als solcher gegeben u. ist nicht naturhaft bedingt." Cremer-Koegel, p. 985. Cf. Cremer, articles "Fleisch" and "Geist," PRE, VI, 98 ff., 450 ff.

It signifies (a) the substance of the human or animal body. . . . (b) the body itself . . . (c) living creatures as a whole, especially mankind . . . The creature is flesh in its phenomenal form and the condition of its being, in the flesh it has its affinities, and among men flesh is the common bond of fellowship. Thus it is said of man and wife, Gen. ii. 24, ἕσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν . . . As flesh the creature thus distinguished is weak and frail, Ps. lvi. 5, . . . lxxviii. 39, . . . Isa. xl. 6 . . . The contrast between flesh . . . and God is not only one between weakness and strength, . . . but is at the same time a moral contrast; . . . "for all flesh has perverted its way on earth," Gen. vi. 3, 12, 13, cf. with l. 31; and therefore God's judgment is upon all flesh, Isa. xl. 5-7, xlix. 16; Jer. xii. 12, xxv. 31, xlv. 5; Ezek. xx. 48, xxi. 4, 5; Zech. ii. 13. But the revelation of salvation is likewise intended for all flesh, Isa. xl. 5 sqq., lxvi. 23, 24; Joel ii. 28; Zech. ii. 13, and is in fact to be an outpouring of the Spirit upon all, Joel ii. 28; cf. Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27.¹

The concept of σάρξ which developed in Hellenistic Judaism stands in marked contrast to that of the Old Testament:

Josephus has no part in the biblical use of σάρξ, nor does Philo adopt it. Philo treats of it, indeed, in the treatise *De Gigantibus*, i. 266. 32 sqq. . . . But he cannot attach any importance to the ethical or religious element in the biblical idea of σάρξ, because his distinction between αἵσθησις, arising from the union of the soul with the body, and νοῦς, leads him quite the other way . . . The starting-point and centre of his psychology lies in his calling man not σάρξ, but ψύχην, and his psychology is further ruled by the identifying of ψύχην and νοῦς, an identification having its origin in Greek philosophy. Instead of the religio-ethical view and estimate of man, we have the intellectually aesthetic.²

The New Testament adopts the Old Testament antithesis between flesh and spirit throughout:

Rare as is the use of σάρξ in the synoptical Gospels and the Book of Acts, the few places where it does occur present not only all the traits of the O. T. conception, . . . it also designates the difference between man and God (Matt. xvi. 17),

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 845-48.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 848 ff.

and carries on the thought farther to denote the perverted relationship of man to the divine principle of life, and to the inward man as ruled thereby, Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38. . . . In the Johannine writings it is primarily the contrast between the divine and human that is expressed in the designation of the latter by the σάρξ which qualifies it, and which is at the same time the O. T. contrast between the power of the spirit and the weakness of the flesh, John i. 14, vi. 63. . . . In the Pauline writings . . . the O. T. antithesis between פֶּשַׁע and רִצְוֹנָה becomes the contrast between the N. T. πνεῦμα ἅγιον and σάρξ . . . The Pauline view is fully rooted in the O. T. phraseology, and simply gives expression to the whole contents of the conception . . . on the ground of, and in connection with, man's personal experience of sin and salvation.¹

The tremendous fact, to which the whole New Testament bears witness, is that Christ steps directly into this contradiction between flesh and spirit; He participates in it and resolves it.² Through the Incarnation, the cross, and the resurrection the antithesis is done away, but not at the expense of the body. The flesh is crucified; but the body is re-created, so that in place of the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός (Col. 2.11), the σῶμα ψυχικός, there is the σῶμα πνευματικόν (I Cor. 15.44). New Testament anthropology is in the fullest sense Christology.

The body of Christ, the manifestation of his humanity, the ὁμοιῶμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. viii. 3, - this it is by virtue of which Christ can become a sacrifice for us, because herein His essential oneness with us is authenticated, Heb. x.5, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μου, - and just by means of this we become partakers of the divine nature, Matth. xxvi. 26 . . . Hence we see

1 Ibid., pp. 850, 851, 852, 856.

2 "Dieser Ggatz. findet seinen schärfsten, dem paulin. Ggatz. zwischen σάρξ u. πνεῦμα entspr. Ausdruck Joh. 3,6: τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμα ἐστίν." . Herein lies the significance of Jesus that "er ist d. erste u. einzige unter allen, die σάρξ sind, der d. Geistes mächtig ist . . ." Cremer-Koegel, pp. 980 ff. Cf. Rom. 1.3-4: τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν συνάμει, κατὰ, and I Tim. 3.16: ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι. / πνεῦμα

the force of the Lord's words, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου
at the last supper . . . denoting a communication of the nature
peculiar to Christ, and therefore divine, to man, cf. I Cor.
x. 16, κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ¹

When the word σῶμα is applied to the Church (σῶμα Χριστοῦ),
"it denotes the union and communion of spirit and life" which the members have
with Christ and with one another (Eph. 4.4). ²

The Decisive Content: Jesus Christ

With all his emphasis on the Old Testament, Cremer did not stop there.
The Old Testament and Judaism only provided the proper setting in which to
understand Jesus Christ. When Tholuck spoke of the "true point of union" in
which biblical concepts were fused together and brought into living relation-
ship, he must have been thinking of Jesus Christ. For Cremer, too, the whole
Bible from the first page to the last was illumined by Christ. If we were to
sum up the truth for which Cremer lived and fought, said Koegel, it could be
expressed in one word: Christ. "Christ was his life and Christ was his
theology." ³ The Woerterbuch has a twofold emphasis: The Old Testament and
Jesus Christ. ⁴ Cremer has not read this into the language of the New Testa-

1 Cremer, ET, pp. 537 f.

2 Ibid., p. 538.

3 Julius Koegel, "Ein Streiter Christi," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenk-
blaetter (Guetersloh, 1904), pp. 98 ff.

4 We saw how the Hebraic approach to the N. T. has found widespread accept-
ance among scholars. The same is true of the Christological approach. Here
are some typical statements:

"The character of the biblical revelation as culminating in the incarnate
Word of God gives to the study of the words of the Bible a seriousness and
urgency which no merely secular study of words can have. . . . Broadly, it may
be said that, while accepting ex animo the methods of scientific criticism, the
common point of view is that the key to the biblical revelation is Christ, who
is the proper subject both of the Old and of the New Testaments." Alan
Richardson (ed.), A Theological Word Book of the Bible (London, 1950), p. 7.

ment; it is founded upon demonstrable, philological facts. In the New Testament the great cumulative theological concepts of the Old Testament are gathered up and concentrated in the person of Jesus. He moves within the sphere of Semitic life and thought, within the continuity of Israel's history, "the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Mt. 1.1).¹ The God who was known in the Old Testament as the God of Israel, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is spoken of in the New Testament with the same historical concreteness as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (II Cor. 1.3, Eph. 1.3, I Pet. 1.3).²

In the person of Jesus Christ the functions of Old Testament prophecy, priesthood, and kingship merge. This may be seen in the designation of Jesus as $\acute{\omicron}$ Χριστός, which means "the Anointed". In the Old Testament the anointing

"... The environmental connection of the New Testament as a whole is prevaillingly Jewish." Jesus and the N. T. writers made much use of the O. T. "... They quoted it, alluded to it, and found in it their one great source of religious vocabulary and concepts. ... In the new message a fresh, vital, basic, theological content was embodied. ... This message finds a true foundation and prelude in the Old Testament. ... The focal point and interpreting center is Jesus Christ." Floyd V. Filson, The New Testament Against its Environment (London, 1950), pp. 12, 22-23, 56.

"... There is an inner unity about Scripture. This unity is found in Christ Himself. The prophetic witness and the apostolic testimony are bound together in Him." E. C. Rust, op. cit., p. 8.

It is exciting to find so much unanimity on the question of biblical interpretation. On these two cardinal points, Richardson, an Anglican; Filson, a Presbyterian; and Rust, a Baptist; agree with Cremer, a Lutheran!

1 "Darum sah ich in Jesus den Juden, nicht obwohl ich den Sohn Gottes in ihm sah, und den Sohn Gottes, nicht obwohl er ein Jude war, sondern er stand deshalb, weil er mit jeder Bewegung seiner Seele juedisch empfand, juedisch dachte und juedisch wollte, als das Werk Gottes vor mir. Denn Gott wirkt Geschichte, und darin, dass er das vollstaendig bestimmte Leben hervorbringt, wird die Vollkommenheit seiner Gnade offenbar. Nur so haben wir wirklich einen Gott der der unsere ist." Adolf Schlatters Rueckblick auf seine Lebensarbeit, hrsg. Theodor Schlatter (Guetersloh, 1952), p. 52.

2 "Namentlich ist die durch d. Gen. von Personen ausgedrueckte geschichtl. u. zwar heilsgeschichtl. Bestimmtheit zu beachten, die besagt, dass Gott im Verhaeltniss zu diesen Personen dargelegt hat, was er ist u. sein will;

of prophets, priests, and kings signified a consecration, a setting apart; but more especially, a divine endowment for a holy office. "Oil is regarded as the emblem of salvation (Isa. lxi. 3; Ps. xlv. 8), of saving power, of the Spirit of God. . ."¹ We have one instance of the anointing of a prophet in the Old Testament (I K. 19.16). The high priest is called $\tau\iota\psi\omega$, LXX - $\delta\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (Lev. 4.5). The king is called $\mu\eta\tau\eta\ \tau\iota\psi\omega$ - $\delta\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (I Sam. 2.10, 35; Ps. 2.2, 20.7, 89.39). This later became a technical term² for the expected saviour, the Messiah, who would come to redeem His people.

The name $\psi\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ was also a Messianic title. Its application to Jesus indicated that He was "the successor of David and heir of the promises given to Him" (Mt. 12.23; Lk. 1.32, 18.38-39). "By this phrase . . . all the O. T. prophecies concerning Him are referred to, such as 2 Sam. vii. 12f.; Isa. vii. 13-15, xi. 1 ff.; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 ff, and others."³ Another title associated with the Old Testament tradition of kingship is $\psi\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. It had assumed Messianic proportions and was "a title given to the man Jesus Christ as Messiah, on the ground of His place in the history of redemption (Heilsgeschichte), and in consequence of God's election having been centred

$\delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \text{\textit{Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακώβ}}$, Mt. 22,23 . . . $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{\textit{Ἰσραήλ}}$, Lc 1, 68. . . . An Stelle dieser alttest. heilsgeschichtl. Benennung Gottes tritt d. neutest. heilsgeschichtl. Bez. $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \text{\textit{Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ}}$, Eph. 1,17." Cremer-Koegel, p. 487. Cf. G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment (London, 1950), p. 41; "Biblical religion is centered in an anthropomorphic vocabulary, in God the 'Lord' who 'chose' Israel for himself and in God the 'Father' of our 'Lord' Jesus Christ." Cf. Torm, op.cit., p. 64: "Das Neue in der Vaternvorstellung kann kurz durch Verweisung auf Jesu Wort Joh. 14, 9 'wer mich gesehen hat, hat den Vater gesehen' bestimmt werden."

1 Cremer, ET, p. 579. I. Sam. 16.13, Is. 11.1. Cf. Acts 10.38.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 580.

3 Ibid., p. 559.

in Him" (Mt. 16.16; Jn. 1.50, 11.27, 20.30).¹ In the New Testament the designation ὁ προφήτης "is applied to Christ with obvious reference to Deut. xviii."² (Mt. 21.11; Jn. 6.14; Acts 3.22, 7.37).

The Old Testament idea of atonement, priesthood, and sacrifice finds its fulfilment once-for-all in the death and resurrection of Christ.³ The Old Testament concept of sanctification has its realization in Him. God, as the Holy One, and Israel, as the holy nation, meet in His person. "God's holiness must manifest itself in and upon Israel; Israel must participate in it. . . . Thus Christ is called ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Mark i. 24, Luke iv. 34, John vi. 69; cf. Acts iii. 14, ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος; iv. 30, ὁ ἅγιος

1 Ibid., p. 561. "Man muss nur festhalten, dass in dem Begriff der Gottessohnschaft Christi Beruf u. Stand zusammenfallen. Wie der Beruf, so ist auch dieser Stand Jesu nicht ein erst durch die Auferstehung gewordener, sondern ihm schon vordem eignender . . . Man kann unter keinen Umstaenden von einem zweifachen, nebeneinander hergehenden Begriff der Gottessohnschaft, einem messianischen u. einem metaphysischen reden. . . . Die messian. Gottessohnschaft des Menschen Jesu ist als solche ueberweltliche, ewige Gottessohnschaft Es ist u. bleibt der Mensch Jesus, welchem diese ewige Gottessohnschaft zukommt, welcher messianischer Sohn Gottes war, ehe er noch Mensch ward, u. es war der Sohn, welchen der Vater sandte, als die Zeit erfuellet war, u. liess ihm geboren von einer Weibe, u. gab ihn hin, Joh. 3,16. Roem. 8,3. Gal. 4, 4." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 864, 866-67.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 569.

3 " . . . d. heilsgeschichtl. Opfers Charakter der einer Substitution ist. Es vertritt, was d. Mensch selbst so, wie er ist, nicht leisten u. nicht leiden kann . . . So eignet auch d. Priestertum als bes. Charakter der Substitution. . . In der Hohepriester gipfelt d. heilsgeschichtl. Priestertum, sofern demselben d. Vertretung d. ganzen Volkes oblag. . . . D. heilsgeschichtl. Priestertum . . . findet seinen vollendeten Abschluss in d. Priestertum Christi." Cremer-Koegel, pp. 508-09.

Cf. E. C. Rust, op. cit., pp. 10 f.: "In Christ, God Himself takes flesh; in Him, word and act become one; here prophet and priest are united in the one King Jesus, so that the prophetic strain of revelation in promise and the priestly concern with the covering of ritual offence by sacrifices (which could never avail to expiate man's guilt) are no longer set over against one another."

παῖς σου Ἰησοῦς as in the O. T. the high priest is called in Ps. cvi.
16, ¹ $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\psi\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$."

One cannot think of a single basic concept in the New Testament which does not have Christ as its ground and object. The words $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, ² $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ are but a few of the many which may be cited. Christ does something to the language which is associated with Him. Concerning the Pauline expression $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ Cremer says:

. . . the blessings of redemption, God's saving purpose, etc., are represented objectively as all included in Christ, as objects at hand and made present in Him and with Him, Rom. vi. 23, viii. 2, 39; 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 4, iii. 14; Eph. i. 3, ii. 6, 7, iii. 11, iv. 32; Phil. ii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10 . . . the statements made concerning the Christian subject who is in Christ coincide with those concerning the object, i. e. the salvation, the life which is in Christ, e.g. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ Rom. vi. 11; $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}$ vi. 23, viii. 2, and other places. For him who is in the Lord, . . . Christ is the sphere in which both he (subject) and it (object) exist; and thus the significance of this mode of expression is not to be understood simply as linguistic, but as involving a fact . . . ³

In the saying of Jesus, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ η $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ η $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ η $\xi\omega\eta$ (Jn. 14.6), Hebraic and Greek thought-modes have been fused together and remoulded in the image of Christ. The Greek " $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ " expresses the agreement between word and reality, declaration and fact, while the Hebrew ($\עֲדָרָה$) describes that which is spoken of not only as real, but as enduring and self-verifying." When Jesus calls Himself η $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ this "does not simply signify, as in

1 Cremer, ET, pp. 43, 50 f.

2 The biblical concept of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is soteriological. "An d. Heilsverheissungen A. T.s schleissen d. Heilstatsachen N. T.s an, spez. d. Auferstehung Christi als Anfang d. Erfuellung u. damit neue Begründung d. Hoffnung." I Cor. 15.20. Christ is η $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\varsigma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, Col. 1.27. Cremer-Koegel, pp. 430 f. Cf. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 76, 109, 134.

3 Cremer, ET, pp. 384 f.

profane Greek, truthfulness in word, but denotes truthfulness in the entire character and life of him who can be relied upon, and who approves himself¹ in all things." Christ is the "faithful witness" (Rev. 1.5), "for all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen"² (II Cor. 1.20).

Gerhard Kittel, the editor of the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, has continued and expanded Cremer's Christological emphasis in a most remarkable way:

. . . although the Old Testament and the Septuagint exercises a primary influence upon the essence of the New Testament language, they do not form the ultimate and decisive element. . . . The language of the New Testament has quite definitely but one single purpose, that of expressing that which has taken place, that which God has done in Christ. New Testament words are thus essentially like a mirror; they reflect the fact of Christ, and this they do not in any broken or indirect way, but in actual reality and in genuine truth

"The history of the word εἰρήνη comes to an end in Ephesians ii. 14; 'He is our peace,' αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν. He does not bring a new conception of the term 'peace,' He is it. Or take I Corinthians i.30: ὃς ἐχενήθη σοφία ἡμῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις. Not a new understanding of wisdom, not a new theory of righteousness, not a new morality of sanctification, not a new theology of reconciliation; all these things are, of course, included in the Incarnation by which He actually is Wisdom, is Righteousness, is Sanctification, is Reconciliation."³

1 Ibid., pp. 628, 631. Cremer does not deny the presence of Greek influence in the N. T. ἀλλήθεια: "Der neutestamentl. Begriff in allen neutestamentl. Schriften an αλ. im philos. Sprachgebr. anschliesst, ein Gebr., der seinen Vorgang hat in den Apokr. des A. T., u. eine Tatsache, die nur verstaendlicher wird dadurch, dass εἰς auch in den Schriften der Synagoge in diesem Sinne sich findet." Cremer V, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 119.

2 Cremer says that the "geschehende Bejahung aller goettl. Verheissungen in Christus vorhanden ist". He calls attention to the phrase ἡμῶν (ἡμῶν) λέγω ὑμῶν which occurs frequently in the Synoptics and Fourth Gospel: "Er deckt d. Wort, nicht d. Wort ihn; er deckt es nicht mit einer irgendwie ihm eignenden Autoritaet, sondern, es hat ihn z. Inhalt, u. deshalb ist es etw. unumstoessl. Festes . . . U. so ist dieses einleitenden Amen im Munde Jesu nicht ein Amen seines eigenen Glauben sondern d. staerkste Ausdruck fuer d. Forderung d. Glaubens an ihm, d. staerkste Bezeugung seiner Messianitaet, die d. Amen d. Hoerer erfordert, u. der dann seine Benennung als ὁ ἡμῶν Apk. 3,14 entspricht." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 9th ed., p. 157; Cremer-Koegel, p. 145.

3 Kittel, Lexicographia Sacra, pp. 25, 7, 29.

The Hellenistic Environment

We come now to the consideration of a stream of influence in New Testament lexicography which runs counter to Cremer and the whole development associated with him. This counter-movement sprang up in Germany toward the end of the nineteenth century, and may be identified with Religionsgeschichte of which it represents one special phase. In the 1880's and '90's, most German theologians were occupied with the task of so-called historical reconstruction. Popular opinion in the Church was strongly against traditional doctrine and in favour of a "simple" religion for the common man. The study of primitive folk-lore and religion had proved, so it was believed, that Christianity was not an exclusive religion based on supernatural revelation. It was a part of the long evolutionary development of religious ideas. This could be seen especially in the Old Testament where the movement was from the lower, more primitive forms to the higher. Christianity was quantitatively superior to other religions because it represented a higher stage of development; qualitatively, there was no real distinction. When reduced to its lowest common denominator, the message of the Gospel was seen to contain moral values readily acceptable in a modern middle class society.

In such a theological atmosphere as this, the key to biblical interpretation was not sought within Scripture, but outside it. It was to be understood out of its environment, out of the general milieu of language and culture to which it belonged. When presuppositions such as these were carried into the realm of biblical lexicography they must inevitably come into conflict with those of Cremer. The lexicographical implications of Religionsgeschichte first came to fruition in the work of Adolf Deissmann. In his

Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897) he launched an attack on Cremer's Woerterbuch. The Woerterbuch, he maintained, was built upon the principle that biblical Greek was different from other Greek. Dogmatists had long regarded biblical Greek as though it were a revealed language, a language set apart and in a class by itself. Scholars familiar with classical Attic Greek could easily see that New Testament Greek was different. When compared with the literary Greek of the Hellenistic period, it was still seen¹ to be different. There was no ready explanation for this. Theologians offered

1 Since the early centuries of the Church's history, the style of N. T. Greek has been a much-debated subject. "Under the late Roman Empire, when the old learning and culture came into hostile collision with Christianity, pagan controversialists spoke mockingly of the language of the N. T. as a boatman's idiom." The Latin Apologists made a futile effort to show that the N. T. had a literary perfection which would meet classical standards. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East trans. L. R. M. Strachan (London, 1910), p. 65. The Renaissance, with its revival of classical learning, brought the question to the fore again. The views of Erasmus sound entirely modern: "The Apostles had not learned their Greek from the speeches of Demosthenes, but from the language of common discourse. . . ." (Erasmus on Acts 10.38. Quoted by Patrick Fairbairn, Hermeneutical Manual (Edinburgh, 1858), p. 12. Henry Stephens, in the preface to his N. T. (1576), declared that the N. T., which shows evidence of Hebraisms, has a good Greek style. G. B. Winer, A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, trans. W. F. Moulton (Edinburgh, 1870), p. 13.

In the 17th century, a controversy arose between the "Hebraists" and the "Purists". This controversy was "prolonged in its day partly from lack of knowledge, partly from dogmatic prejudice" Eduard Reuss, History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, trans. E. L. Houghton (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 37. Both sides in this dispute laboured under the same erroneous conception of the work of the Holy Spirit and the inspiration of Scripture. To the "Purists" "it appeared as something perfectly obvious that the Holy Scripture must be clothed in language at least as classical as that of Demosthenes or Plato, and assertions to the contrary were felt to be an outrage upon the Holy Ghost." Deissmann, op. cit., p. 66. Those who acknowledged that there were Hebraisms could regard these as "an assimilation of the style of the New Testament to that of the Old, through an especial direction of the Holy Spirit. Such Hebraisms are not to be reckoned solecisms or barbarisms, but modes of speech, which are peculiar to the Holy Spirit. If the style of the New Testament may be designated by any name, it should rather be called . . . the sacred Greek style." Pfeiffer, quoted in Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 14. The Hebraists would have been right had they realized that the crucial point is not the style but the content.

a supernatural explanation: a divine style, holy Greek, the language of the Holy Ghost. Now, at last, historical science had put an end to these baseless speculations. The ancient papyri, ostraca and inscriptions unearthed by archaeologists in the Near East provided the true parallel to the language of the New Testament. New Testament Greek, said Deissmann, was really nothing more than the "colloquial, non-literary koine" of the Graeco-Roman world. It was "on the whole just the kind of Greek that simple, unlearned folk of the Roman Imperial period were in the habit of using."¹ Deissmann believed that the papyri discoveries would revolutionize New Testament lexicography, and that views like those held by Hermann Cremer were no longer tenable.

Deissmann criticized Cremer on the following points: (1) Cremer's "peculiar dogmatic attitude" detracted from the scientific value of his work. No doubt Cremer wished to be a philologist, yet unconsciously he let his dogmatic presuppositions mar the objectivity of the results.² (2) The

1 Deissmann, op. cit., pp. 54, 61. Working independently of Deissmann, the British scholar H. A. A. Kennedy reached the conclusion that the LXX and the N. T. were written in colloquial language. See his Sources of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh, 1895).

Deissmann denied that he had opened up a new phase of the old controversy between the "Hebraists" and the "Purists". "No one denies the existence of Semiticisms; . . . there is now no assertion of the 'purity' of New Testament Greek in the sense of the old disputants. The new tendency in the work now being done is to emphasize the popular and non-literary element in the language of the apostles and to protest against the dogmatic isolation of New Testament philology." op. cit., n. p. 65. Yet he carries on the discussion on a level with the old controversialists. His analysis, like theirs, is too superficial. Since Schleiermacher, it has been necessary to speak of an inner side to language as well as an outer side. Deissmann does not seem to have realized this. He and Cremer are speaking to two different aspects of the question.

2 ". . . Ich niemals an eine bewusste Bindung des philologischen historischen Urteils durch das dogmatische bei Cremer gedacht habe. Er wollte philologisch arbeiten, gewiss! - aber ich habe bis heute den Eindruck dass seine Begabung eben nicht auf dem Gebiete der Philologie lag Zwischen seinem Auge u. dem historischen Objekt des Woerterbuchs lag, ohne dass er selbst es empfand, manches, was den freien Ausblick hinderte." Deissmann, Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXXVII, 17 (17 Aug. 1912), p. 522.

desire to isolate the biblical language is a carry-over from the old orthodox dogma of verbal inspiration. Philologically and historically, there is no such thing as "Biblical Greek". "The historical method of biblical philology has very many opponents even yet," wrote Deissmann. "Among the conscious opponents, i. e., those who oppose in matters of principle, we reckon Hermann Cremer. His Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecitaet has for its fundamental principle the idea of the formative power of Christianity in the sphere of language. This idea, as a canon of historical philology becomes a fetter upon investigation."¹

(3) The rare and unusual words which often appear in the LXX and the New Testament were not necessarily coined by the biblical writers; in most instances, it appears that they were not. "Cremer was especially fond of distinguishing these erratics as 'Biblical' or 'New Testament' words which were specially due to the power of Christianity to mould language." It can now be demonstrated from the papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions that many of these words were actually in use in pagan Hellenistic circles. Deissmann estimated that "in the whole New Testament vocabulary of nearly 5,000 words not more than 50 - fewer than that, more likely - will prove to be 'Christian' or 'Biblical' Greek words."² (4) Cremer's investigation of the language of the LXX is the best feature of his work. Here he has contributed much to the understanding of the influence of Hellenism upon

1 Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh, 1901), p. 176.

2 Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, pp. 70, 73.

1

the New Testament. However, he has greatly exaggerated the importance of Hebraic influences. The LXX is no slavish copy of the Hebrew original; it is the product of a thoroughly Hellenistic environment. The Jews who lived in Egypt in the Ptolemaic Period probably spoke Greek as their native tongue. Only the educated would have learned Hebrew:

It is more probable that their Hebrew would be Graecized than that their Greek would be Hebraized. . . . The fact is, the Hellenistic Jews spoke Greek, prayed in Greek, sang psalms in Greek, wrote in Greek, and produced Greek literature; further, their best minds thought in Greek.²

The LXX is often more of a paraphrase than a translation; the translators often saw fit to introduce technical terms from Egyptian "popular" Greek. "In this way they sometimes not only Egyptianized the Bible, but to speak from their own standpoint, modernized it."³ (5) Deissmann, like Cremer, is cognizant of the importance of the changes which have taken place in the meaning of religious concepts; he too acknowledges that lexicography involves problems in semasiology; but he conceives the laws of semantics in a different way from Cremer. He maintains, in the first place, that the meaning of words is in a constant state of flux. The meaning of a concept will be partly determined by the outlook of the interpreter in any given period. The LXX was not understood in Palestine in the first century A. D. in exactly the same way as it was in Egypt in the Ptolemaic Period. It is

1 "Auch wer ueber die Aufgaben u. Methoden der neutestamentliche Lexicographie wesentlich anders denkt, als der verewigte Greifswalder Biblicist u. Dogmatiker, kann nicht verkennen, dass sein opus vitae eigenartige Verdienste hat. . . . Wer es hier versteht, das oft trocken aufgezaehlte, dogmatische anatomisch praeparierte Einzelmaterial Cremers zu verlebendigen, wird sich in der Loesung des Problems des Hellenismus sicher an manchem Punkten gefoerdert sehen." Deissmann, Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXXVII, 17 (17 Aug. 1912), 521.

2 Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 77.

3 Ibid., p. 73.

not enough to show simply that the New Testament writers drew upon the LXX; we must ask how they understood it:

We must start from the philological environment in which as a fact of history, we find these authors to be, and not from an improbable, and at best, indefinable, linguistic Traducianism. . . . The work of the Seventy . . . does not close the religious history of Israel, but it stands at the beginning of that of Judaism, and the saying that the New Testament has its source in the Old is correct only if by the Old Testament one means the book as it was read and understood in the time of Jesus.¹

Deissman wished to emphasize, secondly, that the shifting of meaning in words is a universal phenomenon. "Every movement of civilization which makes its mark in history enriches language with new terms and fills the old speech with new meanings." Theology has no monopoly on semantics. "One must apprehend the history of religious terms as being a chapter in the history of religion. . . . Cremer's fundamental idea is, therefore, quite admissable if it be intended as nothing more than a means for investigating the history of religion."²

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79. While I do not agree with Deissmann's presuppositions, I must acknowledge that here he has located the "blind spot" in Cremer's range of vision. We saw earlier how this same deficiency, lack of regard for the immediate environment of the N. T., was noticed by Schlatter.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 177. In Deissmann's opinion, the language of the New Testament was not moulded in response to the redemptive events of God's self revelation; rather, it came into being through a long process of development, through what Deissmann called a "Verfeinerungsprozess". "Dass die realistische Bedeutung die urspruengliche ist, die ethische u. die ethisch-religioese Bedeutung dagegen die abgeleitete, scheint mir ebenso sicher zu sein." *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, XXXVII, 17 (17 Aug. 1912), 523. He has borrowed the theory of evolution from natural science and applied it to biblical philology. Cf. Otto Jespersen, *Language, Its Nature, Development, and Origin* (London, 1922), p. 7: "The distinctive feature of the science of language nowadays is its historical character: a language or a word is no longer taken as something given once for all, but as a result of previous development and at the same time as the starting-point for subsequent development. . . . It suffices to mention such words as 'evolution' and 'Darwinism' to show that linguistic research in this respect has been in full accordance with tendencies observed in many other branches of scientific work during the last 100 years."

Cremer was not slow to take up the challenge. In the preface to his ninth edition of the Woerterbuch, he made direct reference to Deissmann. Deissmann's discoveries were, in his estimation, a valuable contribution to the linguistic-historical aspect of New Testament lexicography; but it appeared unlikely that they would contribute much to the understanding of the theological character of the New Testament thought-world. The views on "Biblical Greek" which Deissmann had ascribed to him were an imputation in which he would have no part. He had never dreamed up a special *accidence* and syntax for Christianity; still less had he said that the language in which Christianity first found expression was the gift of God. "Jewish Greek" is a historical phenomenon. Just as there is "Jewish German," so there is "Jewish Greek"; but this phenomenon is not a sufficient explanation of the language of the New Testament. The Early Church used the concept-world of Israel together with a concept-world of her own. She spoke to the gentiles in their own language and yet in a strange tongue. Some believed, but others mocked. When gentile Christians spoke and wrote about Christianity, they reckoned with a concept-world which was not derived from Common Greek.¹ Cremer included a few citations from the papyri in the

Deissmann's chief exponent in Great Britain was James Hope Moulton. See The Science of Language and the Study of the New Testament (Manchester, 1906); A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1906); Moulton-Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources (London, 1914-29). The lexicographical results of the papyri discoveries were also compiled by Friedrich Preisigke, Woerterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden (1925-31), completed by E. Kiessling.

¹ Cremer-Koegel, xix-xx. Cf. Hermann Cremer, Schriftgedanken, Aphorismen und Skizzen, hrsg. Ernst Cremer, BFTb, XXI, 8 (1917), p. 50.

ninth edition of the Woerterbuch, but he appears to have been rather half-hearted about it. When he died in 1903, many problems raised by Deissmann were left unsolved.

It had been Cremer's wish that Schlatter succeed him as editor of the Woerterbuch, but Schlatter was unable to do so because of the pressure of other work. The task fell to Cremer's pupil, Julius Koegel, and a Herculean task it was. Koegel was obliged to defend a theological method of lexicography at a time when historical criticism seemed to be sweeping the field. An enormous mass of new lexicographical material had come to light, and if Koegel were to justify the continuation of the Woerterbuch he must take this into account. His revised edition of the Woerterbuch began to appear in instalments after 1910, and was finally completed in 1915. Koegel was in staunch agreement with Cremer's basic aims and methods. The book was preserved in essentially the same form; Cremer's own work was allowed to stand wherever possible. Koegel simply added his own comments, additions and criticisms after what Cremer had written. Some of the old articles were reorganized or condensed; a few new ones were added.¹ For a number of years Schlatter had been collecting notations and emendations for the Woerterbuch and made this rich material available to Koegel.

In the preface to the new edition, Koegel took issue again with Deissmann. It was a question of whether the language and concept-world of the New Testament could be studied by itself in isolation or whether it must be woven into the texture of the surrounding environment. Koegel believed that the New Testament must be placed in the setting of its time;

1 Cremer-Koegel, xii.

but when precisely this was done, its wonderful uniqueness would appear in every relationship. If he had not been certain of this, he would never have attempted to re-edit the Woerterbuch. A word is only the outward expression of an inner possession, says Koegel (in language that betrays the influence of Schleiermacher). The outward expression leads the way into the inner thought-world. Scientific lexicography must find a means of penetrating this background of meaning. We must inquire into the relation of thought and speech, spirit and word. This brings us to the revelation which is the chief concern of the New Testament. A new experience and a new knowledge were communicated to the Apostles; a wholly new spirit entered into them; the truth laid hold of them. The New Testament writer groped for words to express what he had received. He can make only a stammering attempt, but he will declare this truth in various ways, approach it from different sides. He must speak of those things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard"; he must communicate the revelation of God to others by means of human speech. He takes the language and figures of speech which lie ready to hand, but when pressed into this service they become something different. They are the old words, and yet new words.

It does not matter how many exclusively biblical words there are; it makes little difference whether there are 50 or 500. What does matter is the inmost meaning of a particular word in its biblical usage. A special lexicon has a right to exist only when it shows the right relation between part and whole, between the mental world of a particular author or group of writings and the whole encompassing world of thought. The principles laid down by Cremer are valid not only for this lexicon, but for special

lexicons generally. He has found a method which is universally applicable. The special lexicon must be produced in co-ordination with the general lexicon, but it has a scientific right to its particular task.

Koegel conceded that the new lexicographical insights from the non-literary papyri deserved a larger place in the Woerterbuch than they had hitherto received. Koegel has learned from Deissmann, but he exercises great critical judgment in the selection and assimilation of his material.¹ It is chiefly the inclusion of more of this material from Hellenistic non-literary sources which distinguishes Koegel's edition of the Woerterbuch from the former ones. In an epilogue which he appended at the close of his work, Koegel recalled that the outstanding merit of the earlier editions was

1 See the articles on ἀγοράζω and δοῦλος in Cremer-Koegel pp. 63, 362. Koegel has added a citation from Deissmann concerning the ancient practice of freeing a slave by "selling" him to a god. The freedman then became the δοῦλος of the deity (Cf. I Cor. 6.20, II Pet. 2.1). "Deissmann mit Recht betont, dass d. Bez. δοῦλος κυρίου nicht erst auf Grund dieser Sitte entstanden ist." See also the article on λύτρον, λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις. Deissmann says that money paid for the freeing of a slave was λύτρον. Koegel, however, does not let the O. T. context go unnoticed. לַמָּלֵאכִים and לַמֶּלֶךְ are used "im Sinne von Befreiung aus Bedrängnis, Gefangenschaft, u. zwar als Term. techn. fuer d. goettl. Heilstat, die Israel erfahren hat, bzw. hofft u. erbittet." Cremer-Koegel, p. 705. Deissmann has found that ἐλευθερία, the N. T. word for the life determined by ἀπολύτρωσις, occurs in pagan Hellenistic documents "die sich auf d. Freiloesung von Sklaven, spez. ihre sakrale Selbstloskaufung von Sklaven beziehen." But Koegel continues: "Noch ist diese Beruehrung natuerl. nur formaler Art." Cremer-Koegel, p. 426.

According to Deissmann, the word παρουσία was used in Roman times to describe the arrival or visit of the emperor or king. But Koegel says: "So wenig annehmbar erscheint es, d. Begriff hier etwa wurzeln zu lassen, zumal niemals von d. παρουσία τοῦ βασιλέως, eher im Gegenteil von der τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου die Rede ist. . . . Naher liegt es darum d. Beziehung z. Synagoge u. ihrem Sprachgebr. zu suchen." Cremer-Koegel, p. 406. "Zu. d. Verbindung von παρουσία u. ἐπιφανία ist d. interessante Parallele zu vergl. die Deissmann vor allem beruecksichtigt wissen will u. die dl Besuch d. Caesar . . . betrifft . . . aber doch nicht ein Anknuepfung an diesem Sprachgebr. anzunehmen ist." Cremer-Koegel, p. 111.

their penetrating insight into the Old Testament thought-world. This was the feature of the work which lay nearest Cremer's heart. Under Koegel's editorship the innermost aim of the Woerterbuch has continued to be to place linguistic research in the service of the revelation which we encounter¹ in the New Testament.

When we look at Deissmann's critique of Cremer in retrospect, it is obvious that many of Deissmann's own arguments fall to the ground. Biblical interpretation has long since moved out of the history of religion era. It is now moving beyond form criticism to a point where we can begin to speak with confidence about biblical theology. If God has indeed acted in history, then biblical interpretation needs to be theological and historical at the same time. If exegesis were to become a branch of the science of history as Deissmann thought it should, the Bible would have nothing relevant² to say to us. It would become a mere relic of antiquity. But, as E. C. Rust has rightly said, "the climate of theological thought has radically changed."³ Those features of Cremer's Woerterbuch which were most abhorrent to Deissmann are the very features which make it pertinent to the present theological situation. The language of the New Testament is essentially theological; therefore, it requires the combined efforts of theology and historical philology to interpret it.

1 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 1228-30.

2 ". . . Die Philologie, . . . allmaelich in den Dienst der Geschichtswissenschaft geraet bzw. zu einem Zweige der Geschichtswissenschaft wird . . . Aber die Folge war eben, dass die Philologie ihren eigentlichen Gegenstand, die Interpretation der Texte um des Verstehens willen, verlor." Rudolf Bultmann, "Das Problem der Hermeneutik," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, XLVII, 1 (1950), p. 49.

3 E. C. Rust, op. cit., p. 12.

Deissmann's notion that one can be objective only when he has no presuppositions looks absurd to us now. It is now agreed in all branches¹ of science that presuppositions are inevitable. Half a century ago, when it was popular to suppose that the best interpreter was the detached, unbiased, uncommitted observer, Schlatter was going his own quiet way. He exposed the fallacy in this whole idea, and so went against the main² stream of theological opinion in his own era. If the results of the historico-critical method of biblical interpretation were really the objective facts they were supposed to be, then why, he asked, did scholars use them as weapons in theological controversy? That hardly befitted the character of a scientist who claimed to be impartial about his facts. Polemics was a technique of dogmatics, not a historical science.³

In this matter of words which were supposed to occur only in biblical Greek, Cremer must stand corrected by Deissmann. Far from putting an end to theological lexicography, this has had a beneficial effect. It has eliminated the danger of a kind of linguistic docetism. Biblical language per se is real, fallible, human language. Cremer cannot be called rationalist orthodox. He was not trying to revive the old dogma of verbal

1 In theology it is no longer a question of whether one is entitled to have presuppositions. The question now is, which presuppositions are the right ones? Cf. Karl Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, I/2, p. 519; Rudolf Bultmann, op.cit., pp. 51, 67 ff.; Floyd V. Filson, op. cit., p. 46; E. C. Rust, op. cit., p. 3.

2 "Dass vom N. T. gerichtete Wort wolle geglaubt sein und verbitte sich damit fuer allemal eine neutral Behandlung." Schlatter, op. cit., pp. 14 f.

3 Ibid., pp. 17 f.

inspiration in its seventeenth century version. He declared that the idea that the biblical authors were mere passive tools in the hand of the Holy Spirit was heathen, not Christian.¹ Yet sometimes one has the feeling that he became so fascinated by the language that he forgot to see the words in relation to their object. He may have had an almost unconscious desire to find an objective sign of the action of the Holy Spirit in those words which he thought belonged only to biblical Greek. He did not draw a sharp enough distinction between the unique content of the language and the peculiarity of its external features. Of what does the uniqueness of the biblical language really consist? In the final analysis it is not a matter of an exclusive vocabulary or of an erratic grammar and syntax. The words are unique only insofar as they refer to a unique Person and the unique events which surround Him. The language of Scripture is not in itself a revelation. Cremer would have agreed, yet there was some confusion in his thinking on this subject. Deissmann did well to cite I Cor. 4.20: "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power".²

Deissmann's method of lexicography and Cremer's are not mutually exclusive. We are not compelled to accept one and reject the other. It is clear however, that Deissman's discoveries do not render Cremer's Woerterbuch obsolete in any important respect, nor does Deissmann offer a genuine alternative to Cremer. Although Cremer had misapprehensions about the extent to which the "language-moulding power of Christianity" had manifested itself in the formation of new words, this was not his primary

1 Cremer, Glaube, Schrift, und heilige Geschichte, drei vortraege (Guetersloh, 1896), pp. 29-30.

2 Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p. 74.

emphasis. He was far more interested in the power of Christianity to take old words and give them a new meaning, so that "terms hackneyed and worn out by the current misuse of daily talk received a new impress and a fresh power."¹ Deissmann and Cremer are each dealing with a different aspect of the New Testament language, and in a sense both are right. Cremer was correct in his estimation of the inner content of the language, but he was mistaken about some of its external features; Deissmann placed the language in its proper philological context, but he was blind to its true theological significance. If all that Deissmann wrote about Cremer had been true, Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament would never have been begun. However, Deissmann's discoveries have been assimilated, and the exploration of biblico-theological concepts still goes on. Theological lexicography begins where critical, grammatico-historical lexicography ends. Kittel placed himself in the line of descent from Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Cremer, and Koegel when he declared that his work had to do with the inner lexicography.²

In his defense of Cremer's Woerterbuch, Koegel had to contend not only against Deissmann but also against the classical philologist Reitzenstein. Reitzenstein presented a greater threat than Deissmann because he invaded Cremer's inner citadel, the concept world. Deissmann had sought to erase the distinction between the language of the New Testament and the language of the environment. Reitzenstein went further; he laboured to destroy the uniqueness of the New Testament's religious thought-world.

1 Cremer, ET, iv.

2 Gerhard Kittel, TWNT, I, vi.

In his book, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (1910) he showed how Greek philosophy and Oriental religion had mingled in the Hellenistic culture of the Graeco-Roman world. The influence of Platonism spread to the eastern boundaries of the Roman Empire, and the nature-religions of the ancient Near East came to life again in the Hellenistic Mysteries. The aim of the Mystery Religions was union with the deity. Those initiated into the Mysteries were supposed to receive a hidden knowledge, or a power of magical potency which would protect them from danger and misfortune. Among the more spiritually minded, the goal was the attainment of immortality. The Mysteries had their sacred literature, a heterogeneous collection of myths, astrological lore, and magic formulae from many sources; Egyptian, Persian, Syrian, Phoenician, and even Jewish.¹ The initiate were said to be free from the control of Fate and the destiny of the stars. The mystery of rebirth, the transfiguration of human nature, liberated them from the psychic influence of εἰμαρμένη. "They already lived in the Beyond, in σωτηρία in the βασιλεία Θεοῦ."²

Reitzenstein compared the religious concepts of Paul with those of the Mysteries and concluded that the Apostle moved in the same thought-world. His conversion, his claim to Apostleship based upon a direct encounter with the risen Christ, his emphasis on mystical union with Christ, his visions, all seemed to Reitzenstein to point to a religious experience of the type associated with the Mystery Religions.³ Even if it were possible, he said, to exclude all possibility of Hellenistic influence and to show that

1 R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (Leipzig und Berlin, 1910), pp. 6 f., 16-18.

2 Ibid., p. 39.

3 Ibid., pp. 48 ff., 54, 58.

Paul was a pure Jew, this would be of little avail in the final analysis. For there was a kind of spontaneous religious experience welling up within Judaism itself which came into conflict with the established traditions.¹ However, Paul's religious concepts cannot be accounted for on the basis of Judaism alone. He was the citizen of two worlds; one was Jewish, the other Hellenistic. The best proof of the Hellenistic influence in Paul is his language. He is seen to employ a number of technical terms found in the Hermetic writings and in the literature of the Mysteries.² Reitzenstein surmised that it might have been Paul's own powerful inner experience together with the practical needs of his gentile congregations which led him to adapt material from this literature.³

Koegel added notes to Cremer's Woerterbuch in which he sharply disagreed with Reitzenstein. To him the philological evidence supplied by Reitzenstein gave a totally different picture. Reitzenstein had said,

1 "Dass trotz der offiziellen Ablehnung der Glaube an die fortdauernden 'Wirkung des Geistes', an Prophetentum, Wunderkraft und Zauber im juedischen Volke wieder zunimmt, dass symbolische Handlungen wie die Taufe Wert gewinnen, . . . dass, wer sich von seinen Suenden bekehrt, einen Geist der Reinheit empfaengt, der ihn antreibt, den Weg des Guten zu wandeln, und dass er so leben soll, als ob er eben erst geboren waere, oder dass der durch die Taufe und Beschneidung hindurchgegangene Proselyt, der aus seinem Volkstum und allen Beziehungen geloest ist, einem neugeborenen Kinde gleich ist - all das kann man ruhig zugeben und es doch fuer viel zu wenig halten, um auch nur den Glauben an die Wiedergeburt aus dem Juedischen abzuleiten." Ibid., p. 57 f.

2 Some of these terms are: ψυχικός, πνευματικός, γνῶσις, ἀγνώσις, φωτίζειν, δόξα, μορφοῦσθαι, μεταμορφοῦσθαι, μορφή, σώζεσθαι, σωτηρία. "Einstweilen scheint uns aus dem Dunkel der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Apostels eine Tatsache mit wachsender Bestimmtheit entgegenzudaemern: er hat ernstlich darum gerungen, auch den Hellenen Hellene zu werden. Die hellenistische religioese Literature muss er gelesen haben; ihre Sprache redet er, in ihre Gedanken hat er sich hineinversetzt." Ibid., p. 59.

3 Ibid., pp. 59, 209-210.

for example, that the biblical concept of πνεῦμα had pagan parallels.¹ On the contrary, said Koegel, πνεῦμα does not appear in the New Testament in the Hellenistic sense as an invisible substance, a higher power of nature, fire, ether, or the like. Paul's eschatology, with its resurrection hope, cannot be harmonized with Greek pneumatology. There is no natural dualism in Paul's thought; the antithesis between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα exists only because the flesh has become the seat and organ of sin. The New Testament πνεῦμα can have its source only in the Old Testament. A comparison with the contemporary literature of the synagogue or with the Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha will serve to make this clear. In the Book of Wisdom, for instance, πνεῦμα appears in the Hellenistic sense. It is equated with σοφία, and is thought of as a substance, a fluid, a power which permeates the world.²

The close connection of πνεῦμα with πίστις in the New Testament marks a basic distinction over against the environment, especially over

1 "Wir muessen uns abgewoehnen, die 'Wirkungen des Geistes' bei den Christen allein zu suchen und zu beobachten oder bei jeder Erwaehnung eines θεῶν, ἱερόν oder ἁγίον πνεῦμα an christliche oder juedische Quelle zu denken. Es wird wenig Behauptungen geben, die trotz ihrer weitreichenden Folgen so leichtfertig und anhaltslos aufgestellt sind als die noch im Jahre 1899 von Cremer verfochtene These, dass die Begriffe πνεῦμα θεοῦ und πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου ausschliesslich biblisch seien (Hauck,) Realenzyklop. 3 VI S. 444, 454, 457)." Ibid., p. 144.

Here is Koegel's reply: "Es ist ja von vornherein zuzugeben, dass sich fuer diese Gedanken u. Begriffe gewisse sprachlich. Anknuepfungspunkte auch in d. ausserbibl. Lit. feststellen lassen, namentl. fuer d. neutest. Zeit in d. hermet. Schriften d. Mysterien . . . 1 aber dann ist auch ebenso zu betonen, dass, wie sich zeigen wird, d. naechere inhaltl. Bestimmung u. Auspraegung wiederum d. Besonderheit u. Einzigartigkeit d. bibl. Anschauungswelt erkennen laesst u. d. Unterschied, ja d. Kluft zu jeder anderen aufweist. . . ." Cremer-Koegel, p. 933.

2 Cremer-Koegel, p. 951.

against the Mystery Religions. "Only he who understands what 'by faith alone' means for Paul will understand what τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον is for him." ¹ The phrase πιστεύειν εἰς . . . constantly denotes the direct concentration of faith upon Christ (Rom. 10.14, Gal. 2.16, Phil. 1.29). ² This community ἐν κυρίῳ which is given through faith is distinguished from every other mystical union. The New Testament concept of ἐν κυρίῳ was grounded upon the Early Church's Old Testament thought-world and upon the Apostles' conviction that the Messiah had risen and that they were in communion with Him. ³ In the life of faith, in this inner union with the Lord, Paul was yet conscious of a remaining gulf, of a continuing separation which must be bridged by faith ever and again. In the Hellenistic Mysteries, one who was πνευματικός was said to be no longer a man; he had become divine; he was a new "I". ⁴ However, the Christian who is πνευματικός does not cease to be a man; his being is not confused with God's being. He is a new creature, howbeit he is still a creature (II Cor. 5.17). The concept of παλιγγενεσία in the Mysteries also involved the idea of deification. ⁵ Once again the great distinction between the two thought-worlds is evident. The New Testament usage cannot be dismissed with the catchword "magical-sacramental", for here παλιγγενεσία means baptism into the historical events of Christ's

1 Ibid., p. 946. "Es ist dies wieder eine von d. Stellen, das es recht deutlich wird, wie man nicht einfach mit d. Vergl. der Begriff u. ihrer Anwendung auskommt, etwa auch d. Wendungen, in denen sie jedesmal gebraucht werden - da zeigen sich natuerl. mannigfache Beruehrungen-, es muss vielmehr auch hier das einzelne, soweit als es geht, in d. Rahmen d. d. Gesamtanschauung hineingestellt u. von hier aus erkl. werden. Da zeigt sich denn ein ganz andersartiges Bild!"

2 Ibid., p. 906.

3 Ibid., p. 654.

4 Reitzenstein, op. cit., pp. 44 ff. 5 Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 26.

death and Resurrection (Rom. 6.3, Col. 2.12). This involves not only the rebirth of man, but also the restitution and renewal of all things. Thus $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is fully synonymous with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$.¹

In Koegel's estimation, there is nothing to indicate that the Apostle Paul was a Hellenist. He thinks Bousset's theory, that the expression ὁὶς τοῦ Θεοῦ originated in Hellenistic circles and was borrowed by Paul to explain the relation of God and Christ to Greek Christians, is false. Paul's Christology was certainly not Hellenistic.² The declaration that the pre-existent Son of God became flesh in the particular Person of Israel's Messiah must have sounded strangely abhorrent to a Greek ear, yet Paul has not softened this down for the benefit of the Hellenists. He will not engage in the kind of metaphysical speculation which would separate the pre-existent Christ from the man Jesus; Israel's crucified Messiah and the Church's glorified Lord are one

1 Cremer-Koegel, p. 239. The antecedents of the Hellenistic Mystery Religions are the fertility cults of the O. T. Paul had to contend against the Mysteries just as strongly as the O. T. prophets had to contend against Baal worship. The baptism, resurrection, and regeneration of the Mysteries was bound to the cycle of nature; there was an element of ever-again, but no once-for-all event. In Egypt, for example, the priestly ablutions and the purification rites which were part of the initiation into the Mysteries were connected with the annual return of the Nile waters which brought "newness of life". See Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 85.

2 Aber es ist eben weder aus d. einzelnen Stellen . . . noch aus d. Gesamtanschauung d. Aps. zu erweisen, dass er Hellenist u. nicht alttestam. gebildete Jude gewesen sei, bes. nicht in seiner Christologie." Cremer Koegel, p. 1103.

Despite Paul's own assertion that he was $\text{Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων}$ (Phil. 3.5), some have persisted in calling him $\text{Ἑλληνίστης ἐξ Ἑλληνιστῶν}$. So Paul Schubert, Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings (Berlin, 1939), p. 184.

and the same (I Cor. 1. 23, 2.2).¹

To sum up, we may say that this excursus through the theological and philological problems presented by the New Testament's Hellenistic environment has led us back to Cremer and his two primary emphases, the Old Testament, and the Person and Work of Christ. To be sure, Deissmann and Reitzenstein have added greatly to our philological and historical knowledge, but the two basic factors upon which the theological understanding of the New Testament must rest still stand as firm and unshaken as ever. I know of no better summary of the situation into which we have now emerged than that given by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns in his book The Riddle of the New Testament (1936). He says:

Important as these philological discoveries have been for the interpretation of the Greek of the New Testament, an exaggerated insistence upon them obscures its linguistic peculiarity. The New Testament documents were, no doubt, written in a language intelligible to the generality of Greek-speaking people; yet to suppose that they emerged from the background of Greek thought and experience would be to misunderstand them completely. . . . Each writer is to a greater or lesser degree struggling to interpret into Greek a non-Greek method of thought and a non-Greek terminology. To escape into a Greek method of thought was to deny the truth of the Christian religion The peculiarity of the language of the New Testament is the result of a new Hebraic-Aramaic-Palestinian

1 Koegel conceded that some Hellenistic religious terms were taken over by Paul and the Early Church. See his notes on κοσμοκράτωρ. "Es koennte das wiederum als ein Beleg dafuer angesehen werden, das Paulus d. in d. griech. Gedankenwelt seiner Zeit u. seiner Gemeinden vorgefundene Terminologie uebernommen u. in seinem Sinne verwendet hat." Cremer-Koegel, p. 625. Cf. λογικός p. 680: "Da ist es sehr angezeigt, an d. Sprachgebrauch d. hellenist. zu erinnern (vgl. Reitzenstein, D. hellenist. Myst. Rel. S. 155), da λογικός spez. vom Pneumatiker gilt geistig, zumal auch in diesem Kreisen im bes. auch zu Ausdruck: λογικὴ λατρεία u. θυσία findet." Cf. also p. 449: "Darum ist es aber nicht ausgeschlossen, auch an d. Gebrauch von ἄρρητος fuer d. Mysierien zu denken, die geheimzuhalten sind u. nicht ausgesprochen werden duerfen"

history, by which the Old Testament Scriptures have emerged with a new emphasis. This whole creative process has taken place in a particular history which lies behind the Greek-speaking Christians and behind the writers of the New Testament books. . . .

In conclusion, when the science of semasiology is applied to the New Testament in Greek, the problems which arise serve only to raise in a peculiarly acute form the problem, first, of the life and death of a single, concrete, ¹ historical, flesh-and-blood figure - Jesus of Nazareth . . .

This was precisely what Cremer had been trying to show all along.

Nor will it be surprising to find that his Hebraic, Christological emphases reappear again in Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament.

1 Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey, The Riddle of the New Testament (London, 1936), pp. 24, 40 ff. This statement by Hoskyns reminds one of what Schlatter had said years earlier: "Aenlich ordnen sich die Beziehungen der neutest. Theol. zur Sprachgeschichte, die noch nahezu unbearbeitet ist. Die fruehe Fragestellung bezog sich nur auf das Verhaeltnis des nt. Griechisch zum literarischen Griechisch, die fuer die nt. Theol. bedeutungslos ist. . . . Auch Deissmann's 'Licht vom Osten' ist von der alten Fragestellung noch nicht losgekommen. . . . Ein Gedankenkreis durch griechische Sprachstoffe zum Ausdruck kommen musste, der den Griechen fremd war." Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments und die Dogmatik, BFTb, XIII, 2 (1909), p. 72.

Schlatter appears to have exerted an influence on Hoskyns. Noel Davey says that while Hoskyns was writing his commentary on the Fourth Gospel he kept by him "a copy of Der Evangelist Johannes, published by Adolf Schlatter in 1930, whose tattered cover and much-scored first six chapters showed how sympathetic he found it." F. N. Davey in E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel (London, 1940), xiii. The influence of Cremer must have come largely through Kittel with whom Hoskyns was personally acquainted. Hoskyns was greatly stimulated by the early instalments of Kittel's Woerterbuch. See his article, "A Theological Lexicon to the New Testament," Theology, XXVI, 152 (Feb. 1933), pp. 82 ff.

CHAPTER III

SOME COMPARISONS BETWEEN CREMER'S WOERTERBUCH AND KITTEL'S THEOLOGISCHES WOERTERBUCH ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT

The Relation between Cremer and Kittel

Gerhard Kittel, in a lecture delivered at Cambridge in 1937, pointed out the connection which existed between his own work and that of Hermann Cremer and Julius Koegel. He declared that Cremer, more than anyone else, deserved to be regarded as the forerunner of the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Cremer's Woerterbuch represented the "first great attempt" of its kind. Kittel told how he came to be associated with Julius Koegel, the reviser of Cremer's Woerterbuch, and explained the circumstances which led him to initiate the preparation of a new theological lexicon:

I was myself drawn into the work in 1927 when Koegel invited my collaboration in a revised edition which he was preparing. Koegel died in 1928, and I inherited his task.

I realized very quickly that a new edition of the Cremer-Koegel Woerterbuch was out of the question. For many years it had served its purpose and it had proved invaluable; but what was now needed was an entirely new work. Fifty years had passed since the first publication of the Cremer-Koegel Woerterbuch, and the material had grown so enormously in that time that no one man could now possibly cope with it all, nor could one single volume suffice. Further, I felt that practically the whole present generation of German New Testament scholars should be enlisted in the work; a scheme which I may say has proved completely successful.¹

Kittel has expressed himself in a similar vein in the foreword to

1 Gerhard Kittel, Lexicographia Sacra, Two Lectures on the Making of the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament ("Theology" Occasional Papers," No. 7 London, 1938), pp. 4-5.

the first volume of the Theologisches Woerterbuch. While he was in wholehearted agreement with Cremer's aims, he could not fully subscribe to his¹ method.

At first sight, it would appear that Kittel's Woerterbuch is so far superior to Cremer's that any real comparison between the two is out of the question. The Cremer-Koegel Woerterbuch is a single volume work of 1200 pages; the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, which is still incomplete, fills five large volumes. The former is chiefly the work of one man; the latter represents the combined efforts of more than sixty scholars. Much of the material in Cremer is now out of date, while Kittel has the benefit of recent archaeological and philological discoveries plus the results of the history of religion and form criticism. And yet, dissimilar as the two lexicons are in methodology and external characteristics, they are brought together by their common object. Both are concerned with words which lead to the Word that became history, the Word² made flesh. Kittel stressed that "we have to deal with a real history³ when we study the history of the New Testament language." Insofar then,

1 Das Ziel, das den Mitarbeitern des 'Theologischen Woerterbuchs' vorschwebt, kann nicht besser formuliert werden als mit den einleitenden Worten der Vorrede Cremers aus dem Jahre 1883 zum 'Biblisch-theologischen Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecitaet', in denen er von dem 'neuen Gewicht und neuen Gepraege', der 'neuen Energie' sprach, die die griechischen Worte dadurch erhielten, dass 'sich der Gesichtskreis des Redenden und Schreibenden mit dem Ausgangs- und Zielpunkt alles Denkens umgestaltete'. Diesen 'neuen Gehalt' der einzelnen Begriffe durch unsere Abhandlungen sichtbar werden zu lassen, ist der eigentliche Zweck unseres Buches.

Freilich mussten wir uns bei aller inneren Uebereinstimmung mit den Zielen Cremers und bei aller Bewunderung fuer sein Werk sagen, dass die Gesichtspunkte und Methoden der begriffsgeschichtlichen Forschung heute in vielem andere geworden ist." Kittel, TWNT, I, v.

2 Kittel, Lexicographia Sacra, p. 14.

3 Ibid., p. 30.

as Cremer has succeeded in disclosing the true content of the language, his results should agree with Kittel's. If technical competence is to be the criterion by which these two works are measured, the honours must go to the Theologisches Woerterbuch; but if, on the other hand, they are judged according to the effectiveness of their witness to Jesus Christ, there is a valid basis for comparison. To test this, the writer has selected three key word studies from Cremer's Woerterbuch, the articles on λόγος ἁγιος and βασιλεία, and compared them with the corresponding articles in Kittel's Woerterbuch.

The Word of God

The Article on λόγος in Cremer's Woerterbuch. - - Cremer has organized this article according to an analytical method; he defines by drawing distinctions, which is the usual method employed in dictionaries. He arranges the New Testament usages of this word into four categories: (I.) λόγος in a formal sense, with the emphasis on the act of speaking, on the fact that something is said (Mt. 15.23, Acts 18.15, I Cor. 4.20, et al.); (II.) in a material sense, with the emphasis on the thing said, on the content of the word (Mt. 12.32, 24.35; Acts 1.1, 8.21; et al.); (III.) computation, reckoning, account (Acts 20.24, Phil. 4.15, Mt. 12.36, et al.); (IV.) reason, insight, consideration (only in Acts 18.14).¹ Although he keeps within the above framework, Cremer devotes by far the most space to the special theological usages, and it is with these that we are chiefly concerned.

(1) The λόγος of Apostolic Preaching. Cremer says that "the

1 Cremer, ET, pp. 390-96; Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 549-556.

to us. He is the Mediator of a two-way relationship between God and the world; He is both God's Word to us and our representative before God.

Cremer believed that the Johannine Logos was grounded upon the דבר יהוה of Old Testament prophecy:

The significance of the O. T. representation, "the word of the Lord," has hitherto been too little considered; or if its connection with the N. T. view has been observed, it has been only in a logical manner, and not historically, as bearing upon the gradual revelation of God's plan of salvation; cf. Neumann on Jer. i. 1, "The Word of God, the self-revelation of the eternal Godhead from eternity in the Word, is the source and principle of all prophetic words; therein they have their divine basis."¹

In his earlier years Cremer shared Tholuck's opinion that a point of contact for the Logos doctrine might be found in the Memra of Jewish theology. "If we are to seek for an explanation of the λόγος of St. John beyond Holy Scripture itself, it is to be found much more appropriately² in Jewish theology than in Philo's doctrine of the Logos." However, Cremer later reached the conclusion that there is no real connection³ between the דבריהם of the Targums and the Johannine Logos.

According to Cremer, the Philonic doctrine of the Logos, which may

¹ Cremer, ET, p. 394. Cf. Tholuck, Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, p. 65: "If we bring together the points of the O. T. to which the doctrine of the Logos can be linked . . . little in fact remains to be done to develop it to the point at which we meet it in the prologue of John."

² Cremer, ET, p. 394.

³ "Man hat seit Semler mit Vorliebe versucht, diese sogen. johanneische Logoslehre auf Philo zurueckzufuehren, beginnt aber neuerdings, namentl. seit Tholuck, auf jenes juedische Theologumenon zureueckzugreifen, indes beides mit Unrecht. . . . Wir haben in diesem Ausdruck weder ein Philosophumenon zur Erklaerung des Weltraetsels, wie es der philonische Logos ist, noch ein Theologumenon zur Erklaerung der Offenbarung, wie die juedische Lehre vom Worte, דבריהם." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 553.

be traced back to Platonic or Stoic sources, arose out of the desire for a philosophical explanation of the world. For Philo the Logos is equivalent to the Stoic world-soul, the world-reason operative in matter, the divine world-idea. The Johannine Logos is not even remotely connected with theological or philosophical explanations of the world, but is intended to illuminate the meaning of the history which began when the Word became flesh, the history which is decisive for the entire world and for every individual destiny.¹ Although some of the attributes which Philo ascribed to the Logos (e. g. *πρωτότοκος*, *υἱός*, *εἰκὼν*) are also ascribed to Christ in the New Testament, this does not prove that the two concepts are the same; in reality they are incompatible. Philo's Logos "cannot in any proper sense be called God". God, the Logos, and the world constitute three stages in the unfolding of the divine life. If it were not for his dualistic view of matter, Philo's system would be pantheistic.² One must abandon the attempt to explain the prologue to the Fourth Gospel in terms of Philonic doctrine.

On the surface of it, the Jewish doctrine of the Memra appears to afford a better approach. In Judaism, the notion of the inapproachability of God, originally a moral-religious concept, had been intellectualized.

1 "Der, den Joh. ὁ λόγος nennt, ist die geschichtl. Person Jesu, u. während Geschichte fuer Philo nichts ist, als an sich bedeutungslose u. nur zufaellige Symbolisierung des Gedankens, auf deren Geschichtlichkeit als solche nichts ankommt, ist fuer den Evangelisten die Geschichte Jesu die Geschichte der Wahrheit selbst." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 553.

2 Ibid., pp. 553-54. Cf. ET, p. 395. Unlike the Pastoral Epistles, the prologue to the Fourth Gospel contains no polemic against Alexandrian exegesis; but this does not prove that the Fourth Gospel is late, or that it originated in a period when the Church had already begun to relate Greek, Philonic Logos speculation to Christ. Nowhere in the Gospel do we encounter an allegorical interpretation of history or Scripture. Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 554.

God, in His innermost Being, was inaccessible to the world; even His name, יהוה, was thought to be so sacred that one dare not pronounce it. Hence a distinction was drawn between God as He was in Himself and God as He revealed Himself to men. The mediation of God's revelation was accomplished through the

God Himself is the word in so far as the word is the medium of His revelation of Himself, and the word, although personality and hypostasis are not yet attributed to it occupies a middle place between God and man, like $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$, $\text{דְּבָרָא קְדִישָׁא}$, with which latter word מְרַמְזָא is used interchangeably; cf. Tholuck on John i.1. That this representation was included in the Jewish idea of the Messiah, is clear from Gen. xlix. 18, where the Jerusalem Targum translates, "I have waited, not for liberation through Samson or Gideon, but for salvation through Thy Word."¹

Cremer says, however, that the Jewish doctrine of the Memra is a pure theologoumenon, and nothing could be farther from a theologoumenon than John i.1-18. These statements with reference to Christ arise out of faith and faith alone; they are not the product of scholarly reflection.²

1 Cremer, ET, p. 394. Cf. Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 554 f. It appears that Tholuck and Cremer were mistaken about the character of מְרַמְזָא . The מְרַמְזָא of the Targums was never a mediating concept or a hypostasis, but only a formal substitute for the Tetragrammaton. Kittel, TWNT, IV, p. 136. Cf. C. Venn Pilcher, Note: "The Jewish Background of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel," The Reformed Theological Review, VI, 2 (November, 1947), p. 30: "St. John had no need to use these more or less remote ideas. By the 'Word' he meant the DABHAR of the Old Testament - the Word of God, which spake to and by the Prophets."

2 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 555. Koegel (10th ed.) added a note on the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of the Mystery Religions. The Johannine Logos has been compared with "d. relig. Volkseinstellung jener Zeit von Hermes als d. Logos (in Verbindung mit d. Verehrung d. ägypt. Gottes That)-vgl. Reitzenstein, Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen, 1901, S. 47 bis 132; u. dessen Poimandres (bes. S. 42 f.) u. D. hellenist. Myst.-Rel., 1910, S. 93 ff.-. . . Es wird uebersehen, welche voellig anderer Inhalt u. welch anderer Gedanke in d. Begriff hineinkommt . . . Eine ausfuehrl. Besprechung d. einzelnen Aussagen koennte erst d. vollgueltigen Nachweis erbringen, wuerde dann aber d. Himmelweite Kluft dartun, die beide Vorstellungskreise . . . voneinander trennt." Cremer-Koegel, p. 678.

The Article on λόγος in the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. - - As might be expected, the article on λόγος in Kittel has a much greater scope and the plan of organization is different from

¹
Cremer's. The contents are as follows:

- A. Linguistic Studies of the Greek Words (Debrunner)
λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, λαλέω
- B. The Logos in Greek Culture and Hellenism (Kleinknecht)
 1. The manifold Meaning of the Word Logos
 2. The Development of the Greek Logos Concept
 3. The Logos in Hellenism
 4. The λόγος of Philo of Alexandria
 5. Hellenistic Logos Speculation and the N. T.
- C. The "Word of God" in the O. T. (Procksch)
 1. The Hebrew Terms for "Word"
 2. רַב־דָּבָר as the Equivalent of λόγος and ῥῆμα
 3. The רַב־דָּבָר of prophetic Revelation
 4. The רַב־דָּבָר as the Revelation of the Law
 5. The divine creative Word
 6. The "Word" in the Poetry of the O. T.
- D. "Word" and "Speech" in the N. T. (Kittel)
 1. General Observations regarding the N. T. usage of λέγω / λόγος
 2. Weakened and technical Meanings of λόγος
 3. The Words of Jesus
 4. The O. T. "Word" in the N. T.
 5. The Manifestation of the "Word of God" to Individuals in the N. T.
 6. The Primitive Christian Message as "Word of God"
 7. Character and Operation of the Primitive Christian "Word"
 8. The "Word" in the Synoptic Account about Jesus
 9. The "Word" in the Synoptic Sayings of Jesus
 10. λόγος / λόγος (τοῦ θεοῦ) in the Apocalypse
 11. Jesus Christ, the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ
 12. I John 1.1 ff.
 13. The Individuality of the λόγος Expression in John 1.1 ff.
 14. Interest and Origin of the Johannine Logos
 15. Logos and Torah

1 This article is found in Vol. IV of the TWNT, pp. 69-140.

There is no material in Cremer's article comparable to that furnished by Debrunner and Kleinknecht on the Greek and Hellenistic usages of λόγος; there is nothing to equal Procksch's essay on the Old Testament דָּבָר (Procksch has traced the word through each stage in Israel's history); there is no adequate equivalent for Kittel's comprehensive treatment of the New Testament "Word of God". But after one has availed himself of the new material and the better insights furnished by Kittel and his collaborators, he must still acknowledge that Kittel's article and Cremer's have something in common. Kittel bears Cremer out in this important respect: both testify to the importance of the Old Testament prophetic word and to the fact that the New Testament Word is concentrated in the Person of Jesus. The Old Testament Word has its fulfilment in Christ, who is the object of the New Testament word of proclamation. Jesus Christ is the culmination of the entire Heilsgeschichte. Observations which appear in embryonic form in Cremer have come to full expression in Kittel. This becomes evident when the pertinent passages from both articles are placed in parallel columns.

1. The "Word" of O. T. Prophecy

Cremer:

"Von der Mitteilung des Heilswortes an die Propheten heisst es durchgaengig דָּבָר יְהוָה הָיָה אֵלַי von dem Vernehmen des Wortes heisst es הָיָה דָּבָר יְהוָה
Jes. 2,1. Mich. 1,1. Am. 1,1
(vgl. Ps. 89,20. Jes. 13,1.

Kittel:

". . . Der Prophet in pneumatischer Ergriffenheit empfaengt fuer das uebersinnliche Bild Auge und Ohr . . . (IV, p. 92) Die Buecher der Schriftpropheten werden gerne eingeleitet durch die Formel דָּבָר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֵלַי [הוֹשַׁע]
(Hos 1,1; Mi 1,1; Zeph 1,1; vgl

1 Chron. 25,5: אֲדָבָרִי הָאֵלֶּיִם
 אֲלֵךְ הַכֹּהֵן. . . . Das
 'Wort des HERRN' . . . be-
 darf noch der besonderen
 Oeffnung eines geeigneten
 Organs (אֵזֶר) schauen von
 ekstatischen Zuständen)." (6th ed., p. 552)

Mal 1,1)" (p.95) Procksch brings out a significant point overlooked by Cremer: "Jedes Prophetenwort ist wirksame Kraft, und der Inbegriff aller Prophetie ist das lebendige, ewig bestehende Gotteswort. . . . Das Wort ist als himmlische Kraft erkannt, die schoepferisch auf Erden wirkt und ihr Werk ausrichtet." (p. 97)

2. The Connection between the O. T. and N. T. "Word of God"

Cremer:

"Diese Auffassung des joh. Logos schliesst sich, wie erhellt, an den Verlauf der Heilsoffenbarung an . . . zu wenig ist bisher die wichtige alttestam. Voraussetzung beruecksichtigt worden, u. wo der Zusammenhang, wenn auch undeutlich, erkannt ist, ist derselbe nicht heilsgeschichtlich nur logisch gefasst worden." (2nd ed., p. 395)

Kittel:

"In allen diesen Faellen ist die vom AT entwickelte Praegung des אֱלֹהִים דְּבַר nicht nur als Vorstufe des nt. lichen aufgenommen, sondern behaelt ihre urspruengliche Bezogenheit auf das at.liche Offenbarungswort selbst. . . . Damit ist freilich der Weg offen zu einer Betrachtung fuer welche die Gesamtheit dieses heilsgeschichtlichen Handeln Gottes 'Wort Gottes' wird, so wie denn Kol 1,25 . . . Hb 4,12 Alten und Neuen Bund mit dem Terminus λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ zusammenfassen, womit die Einheit beides konstruiert ist, so dass das at.liche Wort grundsatzlich auf gleichen Werkstufe - eben des 'Wortes Gottes' - mit dem nt.lichen steht." (p. 113)

3. Jesus' Creative Word of Power

"Das Wort, die Rede als Handlung . . . Luc. 4,32: ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ . . . So, wo von der Wirkungskraft Christi durchs Wort die Rede ist, z. B. Mtth. 8,8: μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ 8,16: ἐξέβλε τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ Luc. 7,7." (6th ed., p. 550)

". . . Das 'Wort' wirksames selbst handelndes ist . . . Nichts andres will die Bitte ausdruecken die heilendes Handeln meint und nur von dem εἰπὲ λόγῳ redet (Mt 8,8; Lk 7,7); . . . nichts andres vollends die zahllosen, fast alles 'Wunder'-Erzaehlungen charakterisierenden Berichte von Vorgaengen, in denen irgendein gesprochenes Wort sein heilendes (Mk 2,10 ff), erweckende (Lk 7,14 f), ueber Daemonen (Mk 1,25 f) und Elemente (Mk 4,39) herrschende Macht zur Wirkung bringt." (p. 107)

4. The Word of Apostolic Proclamation

Cremer:

"Dieses κ. ε. sogen. Wort ist der Ausdruck des Geheimnisses Christi Col. 4,3 . . . das Wort der Heilsverkündigung . . . Col. 1,5: ἦν (ἐλπίδα) προσηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Act. 15,7: ὁ λόγος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Eph. 1,13: ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν. Vgl. Act. 13,26: ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη. Sonst wird es noch inhaltl. bz. als ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς 2 Cor. 5,19. Act. 20,32: ὁ λόγος τῆς χάριτος θεοῦ 1 Cor. 1,16: ὁ λ. τοῦ σταυροῦ Phil. 2,16: Col. 3,16: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Hebr. 5,15: λ. δικαιοσύνης.

Kittel:

". . . Immer war dieses 'Wort Gottes' an Israel und an die Voelker die Missionspredigt des Petrus, des Paulus und der anderen Apostel, deren Inhalt allein Christus ist. Das 'Wort Gottes' ist das Wort von Jesus." (p. 116) "Die apostolische Verkündigung . . . von ihm sagte, dass Er nicht nur des Gesetzes τέλος verkündigt habe, sondern sei (R 10,4); das Er ἐγενήθη: zur σοφία, δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιασμός, ἀπολύτρωσις (1 K 1,30); dass Er nicht nur ein Botschaft des Friedens bringe, sondern ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη (Eph 2,14)." (pp.128 f.)

5. The Johannine Logos

a. The Historical Person of Jesus

"Was aber Johannes von Christo als dem λόγος sagt, hat nicht im entferntesten etwas mit theolog. oder philosoph. Welterklärung zu thun, sondern hat den Zweck, die Bed. der Geschichte ins Licht zu stellen, welche mit der Fleischwerdung des Wortes begonnen hat . . . (p. 553) "Denn dies ist nicht die Bed. der Uebertragung eines Begriffes zu Personbezeichnung, - sondern Christus ist und repraesentiert deshalb in seiner Person das, was Gott der Welt zu sagen hat u. gesagt hat. . . (p. 552)

". . . Die Aussage nicht aus einer Reflexion und aus einer religios-mythischen oder auch theologischen Idee eines praexistenzwesens entstanden ist, sondern an dem θεῶσθαι der geschichtlichen Gestalt Jesu . . . Das nt. liche und so auch das johanneische Denken aber hat keinerlei primaeres Interesse an einer 'Weltvernunft' oder an einem halbgoettlichen Zwischenwesen 'Logos', . . . ebensowenig an messianologischen oder theologischen 'Vorstellungen', die auf eine bestimmte Person uebertragen werden; ueberhaupt nicht an 'Vorstellungen' - auch nicht theologischen - : sondern einzig und allein an dem in der Person Jesu Geschehenen." (p. 134)

(1) The Greek idea of holiness. Cremer examines the five synonyms used by the Greeks to convey the idea of holiness, ἱερός, ὅσιος, σεμνός, ἄγιος, ἁγνός, and concludes that none of these words adequately expresses what the Old and New Testaments are saying when they speak of holiness. He declares that "the Greeks did not possess the true conception of holiness," and that "the scriptural conception of God's holiness . . . is diametrically opposite to all the Greek notions . . ."¹ ἱερός is the most important of the five synonyms. "Sometimes . . . kings are called ἱεροί, because they are under the protection of the gods, and derive their dignity from the gods . . ." One initiated into the mysteries was referred to as ὁ ἱερός ἄνθρωπος. The word was applied to everything consecrated to the gods and connected with them. "The ethical character of the biblical holy is quite foreign to the Greek ἱερός."²

(2) The Old Testament concept of holiness. Cremer found the etymology of the Hebrew word קדש difficult to trace. He believed that "there lies at the basis of the conception of holiness the idea of a contrast with what is general or common, and therefore of distinction and separation" (קדש is the antithesis of כלל).³ The Old Testament "receives its peculiar colour, definiteness, and fullness by the circumstance that it is applied only to God and to what is God's."⁴ It is a relative concept (Verhaeltnisbegriff), but the relation must be conceived from God's side, not from man's side. Holiness is predicated first of God

1 Cremer, ET, p. 36.

2 Ibid., p. 38.

3 Ibid., p. 595.

4 Ibid., p. 596.

and then of other things in a derivative sense.¹ It is "a purely Israelitish conception, belonging therefore to the economy of redemption". To be sure, the word occurs outside Israel, but "we must not explain the O. T. concept from outside".² We can say that "God's holiness is the essential element of His self-revelation to Israel":

The self-manifestation of God in the leadings and history of His people in preparing a way for and bringing about their ultimate salvation, is a manifestation of His holiness . . . The holiness of God in this its significance meets us in that primary saving act, the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt (Ex. xv.; cf. Num. xx. 12, 13; Josh. iii. 5). . . Henceforward God in His holiness is present among His people, and the place of His presence is His sanctuary . . . God's holiness, accordingly, must manifest itself in and upon Israel; Israel must participate in it.³

The "heilsgeschichtlich" character of God's holiness is now clearly apparent.⁴ "Opposition to sin is the first impression which man receives of God's holiness"; either his sin must be removed or he comes under judgment (Is. 6).⁵

God's holiness and the place where He dwells demand, and at the same time render possible an atonement, Lev. xvi. 16, 33, Num. viii. 19, which can be affected only in the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 17, 27 . . . God's holiness, which not only gives, but itself constitutes, the law for Israel, at the same time provides redemption . . . By the law, the Decalogue and the ceremonial law . . . God prepares Israel to be His possession and His sanctuary, that He may show them His grace: cf. Num. viii. 19.⁶

1 "Das Verhaeltnis zur Welt bildet die Grundvorstellung, so dass es sich nicht um ein Verhaeltnis von unten nach oben, sondern von oben nach unten handelt." Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 42. Cf. ET, p. 597.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 600.

3 Ibid., pp. 42-44

4 Ibid., p. 46.

5 Ibid., p. 46 f.

6 Ibid., pp. 43, 45.

The Greek word chosen by the LXX as an equivalent for $\psi\iota\tau\iota$ is $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$. This word has received a "distinct impress in biblical usage" so that it now bears the full meaning of the Hebrew $\psi\iota\tau\iota$.¹

(3) $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the New Testament. According to Cremer, "the N. T. does not introduce what is actually new, it simply adopts a conception clearly and definitely expressed in the O. T.; but the thing itself which corresponds to the word is realized in the N. T."² The word is applied to God the Father, although not so frequently as in the Old Testament (John 17.11; I John 2.20; I Pet. 1.15-16; Rev. 4.8, 6.10, et al.); to Jesus Christ, $\circ\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (Mk. 1.24, Lk. 4.34, John 6.69); and to the Spirit (Mt. 1.18, Mk. 1.8, Lk. 1.15, et al.).

Cremer places special emphasis upon the Holy Spirit:

. . . Holiness is in the N. T. $\kappa\alpha\tau'\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ the predicate of the Spirit of God, not only as He is the bearer and mediator of the revelation at every stage, but also as He has appeared amongst mankind as a new divine principle of life. . . While in the O. T. the Spirit of God is called the Holy Spirit only in Ps. 141.13, Is. lxiii. 10, 11, the expression $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ runs throughout the N. T. as the designation of the Spirit; and this is perfectly in harmony with the presence of God, whose holiness is the hallowing of His people, being now realized in the Holy Ghost.³

The divine holiness which determines and controls the Heilsgeschichte has finally been made manifest in Christ (Rom. 1.3).⁴

The sanctification of the Church is an act of "elective appropriation". Believers are $\dot{\iota}\chi\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\ \text{'}\text{Ιησο\omicron\varsigma}$ (I Cor. 1.2) "because this divine and saving act is accomplished in Christ and mediated

1 Ibid., p. 41.

2 Ibid., p. 41.

3 Ibid., p. 50.

4 Ibid., p. 52.

through Him . . . Specially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ, or the blood of Christ, appears as the subject accomplishing the sanctification . . . It is in keeping neither with the character nor with the language of the N. T. to speak of a sanctification which is at bottom a self-sancti-¹fication." The New Testament saints ("ἁγιοι") are also the ἐκλεκτοί and the ἡγαπημένοι (Col. 3.12). Sinful man is excluded from fellowship with the Holy God, but in His electing love God effects pardon and atone-²ment through Jesus Christ.

The Article on ἁγιος in Kittel's Woerterbuch. - - We may begin³ our examination of this article by noting the contents:

- A. ἁγιος in Greek Culture and Hellenism (Procksch)
- B. The Application of the Holiness Concept in the O. T.
- C. The History of the Concept in the O. T.
 - 1. The Pre-Prophetic Period
 - 2. The Prophetic Theology
 - 3. The Post-Exilic Period
 - 4. Philo and Josephus
- D. The Concept of Holiness in Rabbinic Judaism (Kuhn)
- E. ἁγιος in the N. T. (Procksch)
 - 1. The Holiness of God
 - 2. Jesus Christ as
 - 3. The Holy Spirit
 - 4. The Holiness of the
 - 5. The Holy Life of the Christian
 - 6. The Ecclesia triumphans

When we compare these essays by Procksch and Kuhn with Cremer's article on ἁγιος certain differences are apparent. The Old Testament concept has been treated more historically by Procksch who has dealt with

1 Ibid., pp. 54 f., 57.

2 Ibid., pp. 46 f.

3 This article is found in Vol. I of the TWNT, pp. 87-112.

the pre-prophetic, prophetic, and post-exilic periods in consecutive order. Cremer said nothing about Philo and Josephus in his article but Procksch has a section on them. However, Procksch's findings are quite in keeping with what Cremer has said elsewhere about the theology of Philo and Josephus.¹ The section by Kuhn on Rabbinic Judaism opens up another phase in the history of the concept which Cremer left unexplored. Procksch's notes on the usage of ἄγχιος in the later Hellenistic period are also a new contribution to our understanding of this concept.²

Procksch has shown that Cremer's idea of the etymology of ωτρ was not quite correct.

Cremer:

"Der Begriff von ωτρ . . . ein rein israelitischer u. heilsoekonomischer Begriff ist. . . Die Spuren ausserisraelitischer Vorkommens des Wortes aeusserst duerftig sind. . ." (6th ed., pp. 41, 45)

Procksch:

"Die Wurzel ωτρ ist wahrscheinlich nicht urhebraeisch, sondern kanaanaeisch. . ." (I, p. 88)

Cremer wished to emphasize the moral element in ωτρ. Procksch has indicated that ωτρ was not originally a moral concept. Instead he stresses the cultic significance of the word. Cremer's emphasis on the moral appears to stem from the theological temper and outlook of his time.

1 See, e. g., Cremer's articles on λόγος, σοφία, πρόνοια, ἱερός, μῦθος, ἀλληγορέω, et al; also the preface to the 6th ed. of the Woerterbuch, vi.

2 TWNT, I, p. 88: "Haeufiger wird ἄγχιος erst in hellenistischer Zeit gebraucht. Augenscheinlich hat der orientalische Heiligkeitsbegriff eingewirkt . . . Im hellenistischen Zeit kommt die Verwendung von ἄγχιος als Epitheton auch der Goetter auf u. zwar vorzugsweise von aegyptischen u. syrischen, also wiederum orientalischen, wie Isis, Serapis, Baal . . ."

This is a trait which he shares with the Ritschlian theology, but it remains only an undertone, it never occupies a central position in his theology.

Cremer:

"... $\omega\tau\rho$ - vielleicht von vornherein - ein rein relig. Begriff ist, nur von Gott u. dem, was Gottes ist, gebraucht. . . . Es laesst sich im Grunde nur unterscheiden zwischen Heiligkeit im sittlich-religioesen u. im cultischen Sinne, u. die letztere Verwendung des Begriffes verhaelt sich doch zu jener nur, wie das Besondere zum Allgemeinen." (6th ed., pp. 42, 45 f.)
 "... $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ein rein sittl. relig. Begriff ist . . ."
 (p. 39)

Procksch:

"Lassen sich $\omega\tau\rho$ und $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ unter den Begriff des 'Religioesen' stellen, so ist voellig verschieden von beiden der Begriff des 'Sittlichen', mit dem das 'Religioese' nicht verwechselt werden darf. Das 'Sittliche' hat seinen Ursprung nicht in der goettlichen, sondern in der menschlichen Sphaere; erst bei zunehmender Vergeistigung des denkens verbinden sich beiden grossen Lebensstroemungen." (p. 88) "Von Anfang an hat $\omega\tau\rho$ engste Beziehung zum Kultischen." (p. 89)

We may now list a number of points upon which Cremer and Procksch are in agreement. Cremer's Hebraic, Christocentric orientation is carried forward by Procksch. He says that the Greek $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ has been placed entirely at the disposal of the Hebrew $\omega\tau\rho$ so that the Semitic substratum¹ is perceivable everywhere in its biblical usage. The New Testament concept² of holiness rests upon Old Testament foundations throughout.

Both Cremer and Procksch point to the manifestation of God's holiness in the history of Israel as the Covenant people.

Cremer:

"Die Heiligkeit Gottes kommt zuerst da zur Sprache, wo die Gegenwart Gottes innerhalb

Procksch:

"Wie der Jahwename am Sinai offenbart ist, so hat dort auch Israel als Jahwes Volk seinen

1 Procksch, TWNT, I, pp. 88, 95.

2 Ibid., p. 101

eines von ihm erwählten u. fuer sich bereiteten Volkes beginnt . . . Die Heiligkeit Gottes . . . schafft die Heiligung des Volkes Gottes, indem sie als Princip des zwischen Gott u. seinem Volke geschlossenen Bundes erscheint . . . In den Lebensordnungen - denn ebensowohl dem Dekalog wie dem Cultus, also dem gesammten sittlich-religiosen Leben, liegt das 'ihr sollt heilig sein, den ich bin heilig' zu Grunde Lev. 19,2 ff.: 20, 8 ff. (p. 46)

Ursprung im Gottesbunde (Ex 24, 4-8), und auch aus Verhaeltnis von Gott und Volk, aus der Nationalreligion, haftet der Begriff der Heiligkeit. Weil Gott jederzeit in der Mitte des Volkes wohnt, so soll Israel ein קֹדֶשׁ sein (Dt 7,6; 26,19; vgl Jer 2,3) . . . (p. 91)

Cremer and Procksch both speak of the double-sided character of God's holiness which may be experienced both as judgment and as redemption.

"Diese zweiseitige Erscheinung der Heiligkeit Gottes, in Gericht u. Erloesung, werden wir stets wiederfinden. . . Es bedarf nur eines Anstosses, um die Heilbringende Offenbarung derselben in ihr Gegenteil zu verkehren, Jes. 10,17: 'das Licht Israels wird zum Feuer u. sein Heiliger zur Flamme werden'. . . Es ist derselbe heil. Gott, der Israel um der Suende willen straft u. doch wieder verschont u. aus dem Gerichte erloest u. in Beidem die Heiligkeit seines Namens kundthut, Ezech. 39,21 ff." (pp. 46, 48 f.)

"Allem Unheiligkeit gegenueber wird das Licht Israels zum Feuer und sein 'Heiliger' zur Flamme (10,16), wodurch es verzehrt und vernichtet wird. An sich hoechste Gnade, wird die Stellung des קֹדֶשׁ in seinem Volke zum Gericht, der Masse zur Vernichtung, zur Laeuterung nur einem frommen Rest. Angesichts der Unheiligkeit des Volkes tritt also im יְהוָה vor allem der goettliche Richter hervor." (p. 93) Deutero-Isaiah: ". . . Hinter dem Gericht aber steht als letztes Ziel die Erloesung Israels . . ." (p. 94)

God Himself effects atonement and sanctification. God in His holiness stands over against the world and everything creaturely. But the ontological distinction between Creator and creature must be joined with the contradiction arising from man's sinfulness. Because of this latter, atonement is necessary.

Cremer:

"Die Heiligkeit Gottes . . . steht im entschiedensten Gegensatz gegen alles suendige Wesen, welches sie entweder richten oder in anderer Weise hinwegschaffen muss, vgl. die bedeutungsvolle Stelle Jes. 6, wo nicht bloss die Suendenerkenntnis, sondern auch die Entsueudigung des Propheten auf die Heiligkeit Gottes zurueckzufuehren ist. (p. 47) "Was der Mensch im Anschauen der Heiligkeit Gottes empfindet, ist etwas Anderes, als bloss seine Geschoepflichkeit, Jes. 6." (p. 44) "Wo Menschen sich oder Andere dem Herrn heiligen, geschieht es durch Opfer u. Reinigung, Entsueudigung u. Versoehnung, 2 Chron. 29, 19. Hiob 1, 5. Ex. 19, 10 ff." (p. 51)

Procksch:

"Damit geht der Begriff der Heiligkeit in den der Goettlichkeit ueber, so dass Jahwes heiliger Name allem Geschoepflichen gegenuebertritt." (p. 91) ". . . In der Erscheinung des Goettlichen fuehlt er Isaiahs den toedlichen Gegensatz zu seiner eigenen Natur, da er $\kappa\alpha\tauὰ \lambda\alpha\iota\alpha$ $\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ 'unrein' ist, so dass er sterben zu muessen glaubt. . . . Die Unreinheit nicht physischer sondern sittlicher Art ist. . . . Wohl ist Versoehnung implicite stets erforderlich, wo es sich um die kultische Begegnung des Menschen mit dem heiligen Gott handelt. . . . Aber hier geht die Versoehnung nicht vom Menschen aus, . . . sondern von Gott . . ." (p. 93)

The Old Testament concept has its realization in the New Testament in Jesus Christ $\delta \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. The relation between the Hebrew cult and the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ is most apparent in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Cremer:

"Damit solche Heiligung zu Stande komme, ist ein Opfer erforderlich; Hebr. 10, 29: $\epsilon\nu \ \tau\omega \ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota \ \tau\eta\varsigma \ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma \ \eta\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$, 13, 12: $\epsilon\nu\alpha \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\theta\eta \ \delta\iota\alpha \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \epsilon\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon \ \alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu$ 10, 10: $\eta\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota \ \epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \delta\iota\alpha \ \tau\eta\varsigma \ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\text{-}\phi\omicron\rho\alpha\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \text{I}\omega\text{. X.}$ (p. 55) "Speciell in Hebraeerbr. erscheint Christus resp. das Blut Christi als Subj. der Heiligung . . ." (p. 57)

Procksch:

"Wie der Hohepriester, der als figura Christi erscheint, jaehrlich einmal im Allerheiligsten (Hb 9, 3: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega\nu$) nicht ohne Blut (v 7) fuer sich u. das Volk Versoehnung erwirkt, so Christus als Priester u. Opfer durch sein Blut (9, 25 f). Das Allerheiligste ist Antityp des Himmels als Wohnort Gottes, in den Jesus durch seinen Tod eingegangen ist und wo er die Christen vor Gott als Priester vertritt." (p. 103)

The holiness of the Church, which was touched upon briefly by Cremer, has been discussed at greater length by Procksch. The material which Procksch has included on the Holy Spirit properly corresponds with Cremer's article on πνεῦμα. Both note the function of the Spirit in the history, person, and work of Christ.

The Kingdom of God

The Articles on βασιλεύς, βασιλεία in Cremer's Woerterbuch. --

In his definition of βασιλεία Cremer draws a distinction between "kingship" and "kingdom". Βασιλεία in classical Greek denotes "the dignity, power, and form of government, as well as (especially in later Greek) the sphere of government belonging to a βασιλεύς; and therefore kinghood or kingship, as well as kingdom". In the LXX, where it corresponds to מַלְכוּת, it is a designation of majesty and power. When it is the LXX equivalent for ²מַלְכוּת, it usually means kingdom, realm. "It is in the New Testament a designation of power, Rev. xii. 10., xvii. 18. et al. . . . In the remaining passages מַלְכוּת denotes the sphere of rule, realm, or kingdom: Matt. iv. 8; Luke iv. 5 . . ." ³Cremer seemed to sense that his method did not suit his subject-matter, for later he added a note to the effect that this bifurcation of the meaning was foreign to the ⁴Hebrew way of thinking.

1 Cremer, ET, p. 658.

2 Ibid., p. 659.

3 Ibid., p. 133.

4 "Beide Seiten d. Begriffs sind bes. f. d. hebr. Sprachgefuehl nicht so scharf auseinanderzuhalten, zumal d. Oriental nicht abstrakt zu denken pflegt u. sich f. ihn auch mit scheinbar abstrakten Vorstellungen eine ganz reale Anschauung verbindet." Cremer-Koegel, p. 204.

In his article on βασιλεύς, Cremer notes that God is frequently designated King in the Old Testament; "especially is God a King in His relation to Israel" (Deut. 33.5; I Sam. 8.7, 12.12; Judg. 8.23). This divine kingship has a soteriological aim for Israel (Is. 33.22, 43.15, 52.7; Ps. 74.12) and ultimately for the whole world (II K. 19.15 ff.; Ps. 93-99; Is. 2.1 ff.; Jer. 10.7, 10; Dan. 6.26 f.; Zech. 14.9, 16).¹ The Israelite king was sometimes referred to as ה'יְהוָה מָשִׁיחַ the Lord's Anointed. Thus his kingship was based upon "divine ordainment and endowment".² From this, Cremer passes to Messianic kingship without explaining how the earlier tradition developed into the later expectation. He has left a gap between the pre-exilic monarchy and post-exilic Messianic ideas. Concerning the Messianic kingship he says:

The Messiah is king, as He is called and sent to carry out the redeeming purposes of God concerning His people, and finally concerning the world . . . As the Messiah, Jesus is designated βασιλεύς, and, indeed in the first instance, β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Matt. 11. 2 . . .
 ο β. τοῦ Ἰσραήλ Mark xv. 32 . . .³

Cremer has made a detailed investigation of the rabbinic concept מלכות שמים. In the Talmud and Midrash מלכות was employed as a substitute for the name of God "which, out of reverence, one shrinks from naming".⁴ Thus we find the expression מלכות שמים used to denote God's rule, His all-prevailing dominion:

. . . Berach. 11.2, "Why do we pray, מלכות
 (Deut. vi. 4-9) before מלכות מן ה' (Deut. xi. 13-21)? Because we first submit to the yoke of heaven's rule, and afterwards to the yoke of heaven's

1 Cremer, ET, p. 131.

2 Ibid., p. 580.

3 Ibid., pp. 132. 131.

4 Ibid., p. 662.

rule, and afterwards to the yoke of heaven's command." . . .
 Babylonian Gemara, Berach. ii. f. 13.2, "When one puts his
 hand over his face to pray, he takes upon himself the yoke of
 the kingdom of heaven."¹

מלכות שמים in a Messianic sense is very rare in the rabbinic
 literature.² Cremer cites some passages which he believes are Messianic
 (e. g., Targum Jonathan on Is. 4.9: "the kingdom of your God hath revealed
 itself").

. . . the latter quotation is of special importance as bearing on
 the adoption of the phrase by John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 2.
 Compare further the petition in the Kaddish, which is clearly a
 Messianic prayer, and which may be traced in its primitive form as
 far back as the 2nd century and might possibly be older. **יְהוָה מְלִיךָ מְלִיכֻתָּא**
 "May He bring in His kingdom," **בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ וּבְרִשְׁתְּךָ מְלִיכֻתָּא**
 "soon and quickly" (in the form of the prayer by Maimonides, with
 the further addition **וְיִצְטָח פִּירְתָּנִיהּ וְיִקְרִיב מְשִׁיחָהּ וְיִפְרֹץ צִמְחָהּ**
 "May His redemption spring forth and His anointed come and save His
 people"). Thus it is indisputable that the expression occurs in the
 language of the schools and of common religious life; and this
 confirms the assumption that Jesus put His own impress upon it.³

Cremer thinks that **מלכות שמים** may formerly have been used more
 frequently in a Messianic sense, but was expunged by the Rabbis after it had
 acquired a distinctly Christian association.

In the New Testament the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ denotes the sphere
 in which the fulfilment of God's promises is made manifest. God's mighty
 act of redemption foretold by the prophets has now taken place:

1 Ibid., pp. 660-61.

2 As we have already noted, Kuhn (TWNT, I, pp. 572 f.) maintains that
מלכות שמים was never a Messianic concept. The Kingdom of Messiah and the
 Kingdom of Heaven were closely related but not identical.

3 Cremer, ET, pp. 660-61. Cf. K. L. Schmidt, TWNT, I, p. 585: "Die positiv
 Anknuepfung fuer den Taeufer und fuer Jesus ist gegeben mit der Apokalyptik
 und dem Rabbinismus in uebereinstimmung mit und in Abgrenzung gegen beide
 unter sich wiederum geschiedene Bewegungen, die ihrerseits auf das at.liche
 Prophetentum zurueckgehen."

As the matter in hand is the realization of the saving purposes of God as proclaimed by the prophets, we at once understand why the preaching of the Gospel commenced with the announcement ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν Mark i. 15; . . . the kingdom of God formed the contents and subject of evangelical preaching and instruction, Acts xix. 8, explained from its connection with the entire course of the history of redemption or revelation, Acts xxviii. 23, οἷς ἐξέτίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν β. τ. θ. πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ... Cf. Luke iv. 43, ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με τὴν βασιλείαν τ. θ., ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπευτάλην... cf. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς β. τ. θ., Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 13 (εὐαγγ., the good tidings of the fulfilled promise of salvation, correlate to ἐπαγγελία the promise of salvation itself) . . .¹

The Kingdom is that sphere in which word and deed correspond.

"With the fact that the kingdom of God offers the realization of the divine purpose of salvation, it is in keeping that the working of miracles by Christ and His disciples goes hand in hand with the preaching of the kingdom" (Mt. 12:28:

The New Testament speaks of the Kingdom as both present (Mt. 11.12, Lk. 15.16-17, Rom. 15.17, Col. 1.13) and future (Mt. 24.34, Lk. 21.31, I Cor. 15.50, II Thess. 1.5):

Now, inasmuch as the saving designs of God already found their realization with and in Christ, it is said ἡ β. τ. θ. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν, Luke xvii. 21 . . . but inasmuch as this realization first becomes manifest when Christ's work is completed, the kingdom of God is spoken of as yet to be revealed, with the tacit assumption that this can only be accomplished after the appearance of Christ. . . . The future belongs to the β. τ. θ. as βασ. τῶν οὐρ. ("sic appellatur cum prospectu ad consummationem," Bengel), but this future is as yet made a matter of conflict by the present. The βασιλεία τῶν οὐρ. was

1 Cremer, ET, p. 133 f.

2 Ibid., p. 134.

here, ere it drew nigh, Matt. xxv. 34, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασ. Ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου; for the world was created with a view to this order of things. It exists and is operative as a possession and as a power, ere the present order of things has given way to it the kingdom of God is primarily salvation, and as such is both the possession and the hope of the ἐκκλησία . . .¹

The Article on βασιλεύς, βασιλεία in Kittel's Woerterbuch --

This article consists of four essays (by von Rad, Kleinknecht, Kuhn, and K. L. Schmidt), and the contents are as follows:

- A. βασιλεύς in Greek Culture (Kleinknecht)
- B. מֶלֶךְ and מַלְכֻת in the O. T. (von Rad)
 - 1. Kingship in Nation and City
 - 2. The Redeemer King
 - 3. Yahweh as King
 - 4. מַלְכֻת
- C. מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֻת in the Rabbinic Literature (Kuhn)
- D. βασιλεία (τοῦ Θεοῦ) in Hellenistic Judaism
- E. The Word Group βασιλεύς κτλ. in the N. T. (Schmidt)
 - 1. The earthly Kingdom
 - 2. The βασιλεία of Christ
 - 3. The βασιλεία of God
- F. βασιλεία (τοῦ Θεοῦ) in the Early Church

We noted how Cremer's article suffered from lack of a historical study of the tradition of kingship in ancient Israel, and von Rad's essay admirably supplies this need. When the Hebrew conception of monarchy is compared with the ideas of kingship prevalent among other

1 Ibid., pp. 134-36. Cremer leaves the impression that the decisive conflict is yet future (in spite of the Cross and the Resurrection). It would be better to say that only the full manifestation (not the completion) of Christ's work is still future.

2 This article is found in Vol. I of the TWNT, pp. 562-595.

ancient Semitic peoples, one finds points of contact together with certain significant differences (e. g., the Israelite king was never deified). Von Rad has sought to locate the starting point for the later Messianic ideas. In the section on the rabbinic מלכות שמים Kuhn shows that in the theology of the later Judaism the Kingdom of heaven was a purely eschatological (but not Messianic) concept.

K. L. Schmidt, who is the author of the essay on the New Testament βασιλεία (τοῦ Θεοῦ), accepts the results obtained by Cremer¹ and endeavors to go yet deeper. Schmidt agrees that the Kingdom is essentially soteriological in character.

Cremer:

"Daher das Reich Gottes Inhalt u. Gegenstand der ev. Verkuendung u. Unterweisung Act. 19,8; erlaeutert aus dem Zusammenh. der ganzen Heilsgesch. resp. Offenbarung, Act. 28,31 . . . Die Verbind. εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν Luc. 8,1; 16,16. Act. 8,12; vgl. το εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλ. Marc. 1, 14. (6th ed., p. 193)

Schmidt:

" . . . Gottes βασιλεία als Gottes Handeln am Menschen eine soteriologische Angelegenheit ist, deren Erklarung mit der Erklarung der Soteriologie ueberhaupt in der Verkuendung J. Christi u. seine Apostel steht u. faellt. . . . es sich beim Gottesreich um das Ganze der Verkuendung J.C. u. seiner Apostel handelt." (p.584).

1 " . . . eine im Ansatz lexicographische, am Wort, in seiner Text-situation haftende Untersuchung, wie sie hier unter Aufnahme und Vertiefung des vom Cr-Koe Gebotenen unternommen wird, von besonderer Ergiebigkeit fuer die biblisch-theologische Fragestellung ist . . ." K. L. Schmidt, TWNT, I, n. p. 579. We may also cite his acknowledgement of Cremer in his article on ἐκκλησία. It has been a disputed point whether the N.T. ἐκκλησία means the whole body of believers or the individual congregation. "The question is generally decided on denominational rather than scientific grounds. . . . A notable exception is Cremer's Biblico-theological Dictionary of N. T. Greek, revised by Koegel (1923), which digs deeper, here as elsewhere, and thus reaches a better lexical conclusion." K. L. Schmidt, "The Church," Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, J. R. Coates, ed., (London, 1950), pp. 1 f.

Christ's proclamation of the Kingdom is accompanied by miracles and mighty works. Schmidt and Cremer agree on this point also.

Cremer:

"Damit, dass das Reich Gottes die Verwirklichung des Heilsratschlusses darbietet haengt es zusammen, dass mit der Verkuendigung deselben die Wunderthaetigkeit Christi u. seiner Juenger Hand in Hand geht, Mtth. 12,28. Luc. 10,9. (6th ed., p. 193)

Schmidt:

". . . das Ganze solcher Verkuendigung ist ausdruecklich gewahrt durch die an entschiedenden Stellen betonte Verbindung von Wort u. Tat. . . . Jesus sieht darin, dass er Daemonen austreibt, den Anbruch des Gottesreiches Mt 12,28 (Lk 11,20). Darnach gibt es also nicht nur Gottesreich-Wort, sondern damit zusammenfallend Gottesreich-Tat." (pp. 584 f.)

If the Kingdom is essentially God's act of salvation, it cannot be brought by man's deeds, but remains God's gift.

Cremer:

". . . das Reich Gottes ein Gemeinwesen ist, in welchem der Wille Gottes von seinen Gliedern vollzogen wird, sowol was ihr Verhaeltnis zu Gott als zu einander betrifft. Vgl. die Grundforderung der μετανοια u. der πίστεως Marc. 1,15. Aber auch als solches ist es immer Product des mitgetheilten Heilsgutes. Nicht die Glieder stellen es her, sondern Gott stellt dies Gemeinwesen her durch die Darbietung resp. Mitteilung des Heilsgutes . . . (6th ed., p. 195)

Schmidt:

"Von hier aus ist es unmöglich, das Gottesreich als ein summum bonum zu verstehen, dem man entgegenstrebt, dem man sich stufenweise naehert. . . . Denn das Gottesreich kommt zu uns, und das ohne uns, ohne unser Zutun. . . . Die Gleichnisse von Gottesreich sind gesprochen, um diese Sache geradezu einzuhaemmern." (pp. 585-86) "Eine vielfaeltige Terminologie zeigt, in welcher Weise es der Mensch mit dem Gottesreich zu tun bekommen kann. Der Grundton ist, dass er Gottes Gabe empfaengt, Gott gibt sein Reich." (p. 588)

Cremer said that the modern misunderstanding of the New Testament proclamation of the Kingdom of God arises, not from a failure to decide whether the Kingdom is already present or still future, but "mainly from

the fact that the kingdom of God is not regarded primarily as salvation".¹

K. L. Schmidt has summed up the situation in a statement which gathers together all the cumulative evidence and brings it to bear upon the most important single truth to be learned from a semantic lexicography of the New Testament, and that truth is, namely, that the New Testament cannot ultimately be understood from either a Jewish point of view or from a Greek point of view, but solely in the light of our redemption in Jesus Christ. Schmidt, who is even more explicit on this point than Cremer, finds the culmination of the Kingdom in the Person of Jesus Himself.

2

In a sense He is the Kingdom.

Evaluation

It would be futile to try to make a case for the superiority of Cremer's Woerterbuch over Kittel's, and it would be equally pointless to maintain that the Kittel Woerterbuch has completely outmoded Cremer. Happily we are not faced with this alternative. Cremer does not belong to the "cult of the genius"; he belongs to a community of scholarship. He acknowledged that his work was "an attempt only, an effort to do, not a result accomplished; it simply prepares the way for a cleverer hand

1 Cremer, ET, p. 136.

2 "Diese Verkeundigung vom Reich Gottes wird nicht verstanden, wenn man den geschilderten Gegensatz zum Judentum uebersieht. Sie wird aber erst necht nicht verstanden, wenn man diesen Gegensatz von Griechentum aus verstehen will. Das griechische Denken, dem wir verhaftet sind, sieht im Menschen einen sich entwickelnden Charakter, bei dem das Koerperliche-Sinnliche abstirbt und das Geistig-Seelische waechst. . . . das hereinbrechende Gottesreich weiss Jesus in seiner Person in die Zeit und in die Welt gekommen, was johanneisch mit dem Satz: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο J 1, 14 ausgedruekt ist. . . . Von dieser entschiedener Tatsache der Gleichsetzung der fleischgewordenen, erhoeten und in der Kirche gegenwaertigen Jesus Christus mit dem zukuenftigen Gottesreich haengt das christologische κήρυγμα ab . . ." K. L. Schmidt, TWNT, I, pp. 588, 591.

than mine."¹ Kittel, too, acknowledged that his lexicon would not be final; it would not exhaust all the possibilities:

All our work as human beings consists in handing on that which we have received and in carrying further that which others have begun. It is, at the same time, our hope that what we have begun may be completed by others and that they may reap where we have sown.²

It is not Cremer's ability as a scholar which chiefly concerns us here (although that was considerable); it is rather the fact that both he and the contributors to Kittel's Woerterbuch have to do with a philological object which is at the same time a theological object. Kittel himself has given effective expression to this truth:

The revelation which God has given us in Christ does not consist of ideas about God or thoughts about men, but it is a history in and through which God has acted. The bearing witness to this act of God in history is the task of Christianity and of all Christian theology. And the more earnestly we take that into account, the more we shall find that the words and sentences of New Testament language cease to exist for themselves and become, as it were, vessels of transparent crystal which have one sole purpose, that of making their contents visible. . . . Thus I believe our work may have its place alongside the work of textual and literary criticism and that of Formgeschichte and of Comparative Religion. . . . we seek in our work to move on from the solid starting-point of philology right to the very heart of theology.³

Kittel and his collaborators have carried on the union between philology and theology effected by Cremer. If they have been more thorough

1 Cremer, ET, vi.

2 Kittel, Lexicographia Sacra, p. 4.

3 Ibid., pp. 7 f., 30. For further notes on Kittel's Woerterbuch see Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, "A Theological Lexicon to the N. T.," Theology, XXVI, 152 (Feb. 1933), pp. 82 ff.; and Karl Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, I/2, p. 547.

in dealing with the historico-critical aspects of this task, they have not surpassed him in theological insight.

Erich Fascher even went so far as to suggest that Cremer's method¹ has some advantages over Kittel's. In the first edition of his Woerterbuch (1867) Cremer had restricted his investigations to those expressions which had a legitimate biblico-theological content. Kittel, however, has greatly increased the number of words to be studied and thus runs the risk of introducing material which does not properly belong in a theological lexicon. Is it really necessary to know the whole lengthy history of a word in its Hellenistic environment before one can comprehend its unique² meaning in the New Testament? Cremer himself tended to depart from his initial insight and was drawn more and more out of the theological sphere into the area of conceptual historical research. Kittel's Woerterbuch is the culmination of that philological virtuosity which was characteristic of the history of religion movement. The older biblical psychology must be replaced by a descriptive phenomenology which has to do with the "thing" contained in the words. It is incorrect to suppose, as Cremer did, that a³ biblical theology in lexicographical form would be unscientific.

1 "Ist die heutige Arbeitsmethode unter allen Umstaenden ein Vorteil oder laesst sich etwa auch ein Rueckschritt gegenueber dem, was Cr. vorschwebte, feststellen?" Erich Fascher, "Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LVIII, 1 (7 Jan. 1933), p. 4.

2 "Komme ich anders der 'inneren Lexicographie' nicht bei als dass ich das N. T. sich von breitem Hintergrund (begriffsgeschichtlich, d. h. z. T. religionsgeschichtlich) abheben lasse?" Ibid., p. 7.

3 Ibid., pp. 7 f.

PART II

SEMANTICS AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

AN APPROACH TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

The Woerterbuch as Biblical Theology

The title Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch suggests the problem which we have to consider next. In what sense is a biblico-theological lexicon also biblical theology? Cremer must have believed that his Woerterbuch contained the makings of a biblical theology, at least, for he quoted Schleiermacher to the effect that "a collection of all the various elements in which the language-moulding power of Christianity manifests itself would be an adumbration (a Sciagraphy) of N. T. doctrine and ethics".¹ At the same time, however, Cremer wished to maintain a formal distinction between lexicography and biblical theology. "It is essentially a linguistic, conceptual, historical work which I supply," he said, "not a biblical theology in lexicographical, i. e. unscientific form."² The Woerterbuch was criticized on the grounds that it stood midway between a lexicon and a biblical theology, and that it was therefore neither one thing nor the other. In a critical review Professor Jordan of Erlangen wrote: "If Cremer had written a connected theology of the New Testament, a number of scientific scruples against his position would have been removed or mitigated, for

1 Cremer, ET, v (Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik und Kritik, p. 69).

2 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., vii.

then it would no longer have been a matter of words, of lexicographical questions, but of the presentation of concepts in the sphere of New Testament religion . . ."¹ Martin Kaehler's evaluation stands in very marked contrast to the above. Kaehler said that the Woerterbuch was meant to be an aid to the interpretation of the New Testament; no claims were made for it beyond that, but the attentive reader would find it doubly significant. For Cremer the Bible was a unified whole whose parts could be understood only in relation to the whole. One does not do justice to the Woerterbuch if he uses it merely as a reference book; he should learn to see in it the signs of a comprehensive² event.

One is tempted to conclude that Cremer's Woerterbuch provides the material element for a biblical theology but not the formal element. But would it not be better to ask whether such a distinction is necessary at all? Aristotelian logic has governed scientific methodology for so long that we are inclined to accept such distinctions almost automatically without examining the presuppositions upon which they are based. Lexicography has generally proceeded according to a method developed by Aristotle for the classification and analysis of phenomena in the organic world. Lexicographers supposed that a word was a thing in itself which could be isolated and studied for its own sake. Consequently they broke each word up into its component parts; they dissected, divided and sub-

1 H. Jordan in Theologisches Literaturblatt, XXXII, 20 (29 Sept. 1911), pp. 465-67.

2 Martin Kaehler, "Nachruf," Gedenkblaetter, pp. 33 f. Ernst Cremer said that the Woerterbuch includes the essential features of Cremer's whole theology. Hermann Cremer, ein Lebens-und Charakterbild, pp. 162 f.

divided. It is most interesting to note that Cremer's teacher Tholuck questioned the suitability of this method in an essay on the lexicography of the New Testament. He pointed to one New Testament lexicon then extant which gave no less than eight different meanings for the word

¹
βασιλεία :

If now such a minute and hair-splitting system of division is injurious to lexicography in general, it is especially so to that of the New Testament; for minute distinctions and divisions are nowhere more out of place than in the word of God; which, like nature, exhibits multiplicity in unity When we pray, 'Thy kingdom come!' do we mean that this is the kingdom itself in its substance, but not the dominion or government of Christ, and not his exaltation as king, i. e. dignitas regia? Or would we say that we mean here Christ's exaltation and dominion, but not the kingdom itself in its substance? Certainly neither. To make distinctions here would be to interpret as a pedagogue, and dilute the meaning of the Scriptures.²

As one ponders over this hint from Tholuck he will do well to remember that the ancient Hebrews thought synthetically and that Flacius employed a synthetic method in his Clavis Scripturae.³ If it is indeed true, as Alan Richardson says, that "all the words of the Bible are intricately related to one another in meaning" then there is nothing to hinder one from regarding Cremer's Woerterbuch as biblical theology.⁴

1 This was J. F. Schleusner's Lexicon-Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum (Leipzig, 1792).

2 August Tholuck, "Lexicography of the New Testament," trans. by Edward Robinson, Biblical Repository (Andover, 1831), Vol. I, pp. 554 f.

3 For a discussion of the synthetic and analytical methods in dogmatics see Otto Weber, Grundlagen der Dogmatik, I, pp. 74 f.

4 Alan Richardson, A Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 8. Since Einstein scientific method rests upon non-Aristotelian premises. See

The method of presenting the material in a series of essays which has been adopted in Kittel's Woerterbuch represents an improvement over Cremer because it allows the concepts to grow and to fuse into one another. Theological lexicography and biblical theology must both deal with historico-critical problems. Indeed, the semantic study of a single biblical concept involves most of the religious-historical, literary-critical, and form-critical problems which would have to be dealt with in a full-scale biblical theology. Cremer is at his best when he forgets the analytical structure of his lexicon and launches into pure theological description. Sometimes he is still hampered by scholastic distinctions (e. g. the formal sense and the material sense of a word).¹ The syntheses which take place in the language of the Bible are not to be confused with the syntheses of Hegelian philosophy. Hegelian thought is abstract and idealistic; biblical thought is concrete and realistic. Biblical language does not converge upon the Absolute of philosophical speculation but upon a Person. We encounter the Universal in this Particular and the Many in this One.

A look at Cremer's exposition of Ephesians 1.10 (ἀνακεφαλαιόω) confirms one in the conviction that a synthetic method offers the correct approach to biblical theology.

Aristotle, Mor. magn. ii. 9, καθόλου συνθέντας τὰ καθ' ἑκάστη κεφαλαιωσαμένους εἰπεῖν Hence ἀνακεφ. = to summarize again, and indeed (a) to repeat; . . . (b) repetition of the κεφαλαιοῦν is denoted in Eph. 1:10,

Encyclopaedia Britannica article "Semantics," (1954) Vol. XX, p. 313. The Logical Empiricists, who have developed a new science of semantics, hold that a word has meaning only in relation to an object. The word is not the thing. Cf. Stuart Chase, The Tyranny of Words (London, 1938), pp. 10, 25, 116 f. Cf. Karl Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, I/2, pp. 513 ff.

2 See Cremer's Article on λόγος, ET, pp. 390 ff.

only that κεφαλαιοῦν here is defined according to its object. Aristotle, De mund. 2, τὸ δὲ τῶν πλανήτων πλῆθος εἰς ἑπτὰ μέρη κεφαλαιοῦμενον is not a similar case, for here stands as is usual for reflection upon the things. The expression in Eph. 1.10 . . . means a gathering together of the objects - τὰ πάντα, and the thought is none other than that in Col. 1. 16, 20. . . . it is the mystery of God's will to gather all together for himself in Christ, to bring all into a unity, to put an end to the world's discord wrought by sin (see κόσμος οὐρανός), and to re-establish the original state of mutual dependence in fellowship with God; cf. Rom. xi. 36.¹

The same thing is suggested by the metaphor of the cornerstone (κεφαλὴ γωνίας, πλῆθ' ὧν) "in which the walls meet, and which connects and holds the walls together". Christ is the cornerstone² (Mt. 21.42 and parallels, Acts 4.11, I Pet. 2.4 ff.).

Redemptive History

The words "Heilsgeschichte" and "heilsgeschichtlich" occur with great frequency in the Woerterbuch. For Cremer biblical theology was biblical history and biblical history was redemptive history. Christ and history cannot be separated from one another, and insofar as biblical history is directed toward Christ, it is His history.³ God's self-designation as the first and the last (Is. 44.6 f., 48.3) is indicative of his lordship over history. Hence Christ's self-designation: ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ . . . (Rev. 22.13). "Ὁ ἔρχόμενος is the content, α and ω of all prophecy from beginning to end. . . . (Christ is the true and essential content of the whole Scripture)."⁴ The expression

1 Cremer, ET, p. 748.

2 Ibid., p. 354.

3 Cremer, Glaube, Schrift und heilige Geschichte (Guetersloh, 1896), p. 24.

4 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 1.

ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ κυρίου (αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ) may denote "the ways which God has taken (for the revelation and working out of His salvation, in order to carry out His saving purpose)"¹. (Rom. 11.33; Rev. 15.3; Acts 18.25, κατακηρυγμένους τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου v.26 ἀκριβοῦς-τερον ἐξέθετο αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδόν) Israel was singled out for a special "heilsgeschichtlich" calling; she is the elect nation over against the other nations (Jn. 4.22, ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν)². Israel's election is a manifestation of the unconditional love of God who freely chooses His object. God's relation to Israel was sometimes depicted in the Old Testament as the relation between father and son, and "this arises from that special covenant relation which God by His elective love established between Himself and the whole people, upon which not only Israel's position as a nation, but, above all, the hope of redemption rests" (Ex. 4.22-23; Deut. 32.6, 14.1; Hos. 1.10, 11.1; Is. 1.2, 63.16; Jer. 31.9, 29 et al.)³. The Old Testament Heilsgeschichte prepared the way for the New Testament designation of God as Father.⁴

1 Cremer, ET, p. 444. Luke and Acts appear to have been planned with the "redemptive history" clearly in mind. "Lc. sieht d. Entwicklung d. Verkuendigung d. Evgs. in entscheidenden Epochen vorlaufen" (Lk. 9.51 ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τῆς ἡμέρας): ". . . d. ganze letzte Lebenszeit als d. Leidenzeit mit Einschluss d. Todes u. d. Auferstehung." (Acts 2.1, ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν): ". . . d. Tag d. Pfingsten als Geburtstag d. Mission. . . . Diese Entwicklung, d. Lc. verdeutlichen will, vollzieht sich fuer ihn, insofern sie nicht aeusserlich festgelegt, sondern innerlich bedingt ist, unter d. Gesichtspunkt gleichsam von Weissagung u. Erfuellung." Cremer-Koegel, p. 929. There is also a "Heilsgeschichte" in the Epistle to the Hebrews which "represents faith as the true and distinguishing bearing of man to the God who promises and reveals His saving plan, during the entire course of the economy of grace in the O. T. as well as in the N. T., see Hebr. xi." Cremer, ET, p. 483.

2 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 336, 571.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 470.

4 Ibid., p. 471.

The Old Testament institution of priesthood and sacrifice was¹ "heilsgeschichtlich" in character. The entire redemptive history should² be understood from the point of view of the divine holiness. Christ's priestly act through which He sanctifies Himself and His Church is the historical manifestation of that eternal election through which God chose us in Christ "before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1.4).³ The wisdom of God, God's eternal decree, is realized in a mighty act which is at once creative and redemptive. God's word is also His deed; Christ is θεοῦ σύναψις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία (I Cor. 1.24).⁴ Similarly, all God's redemptive acts have to do with His glory (Rom. 6.4) which is revealed in Christ and His work (II Cor. 4.6, Heb. 1.3). Glory is the object of the Christian hope (Rom. 5.2); its unveiling still belongs to the future, to the close of the Heilsgeschichte (Tit. 2.13).⁵ The redemptive history has its summation in the New Creation:

"The word new is a thoroughly apocalyptic word, - new name, new song, new heavens, new earth, new Jerusalem, everything new," Bengel on Rev. ii. 17. . . . This is true of the blessings of redemption, still future, yet within the N. T. time of grace. Through the presence of the redemption given in Christ, the economy of salvation is also new, καὶ νῦν διαφέρουσα . . . in qualitative contrast with the old, cf. Heb. viii. 13, . . . The effect of salvation is termed a καὶ νῦν κτίσις

1 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 426. 2 Ibid., p. 49.

3 Ibid., p. 572 f. Here Cremer discloses his views on the doctrine of predestination: "Damit aber wird nicht eine vorzeitliche Sonderung der Menschen in solche, die dem Verderben, u. solche, die der Seligkeit geweiht sind, ausgesagt, sondern es verhaelt sich mit dieser vorgeschichtl. ebenso wie mit der heilsgeschichtl. . . . Das Nichterwaehlthein schliesst nicht schon das Verworfenheit ein. . . . Nicht aus der vorzeitlich dem Gerichte bestimmten, sondern aus der geschichtl. dem Gerichte verfallenen Welt hat Gott vor der Zeit seine Gemeinde herausgerufen zu einem besonderen Verhaeltnisse zu ihm."

4 Cremer, ET, p. 873.

5 Cremer-Koegel, p. 348.

Gal. vi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 17, εἰ τις ἐν Χριστῷ,
καὶ νῦν κτίσις· τὰ ἄρхаτὰ παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν
καὶ νῦν τὰ πάντα.¹

The biblical Heilsgeschichte is based upon a view of history which is totally foreign to the Greek way of thinking. In the thought of Philo, for instance, "the object of faith is not the promises in their historical and redemptive meaning, but God as the true and pure Being, τὸ ὄν, and in the case of things visible and invisible alike, faith with Philo is a bearing answering to the contrast between pure being and matter, between spirit and sense."² Thus "the historical manifestation and embodiment of divine wisdom is dissipated into allegories, and the living realization of wisdom as shared by man becomes an apathetic aestheticism. . ."³

Images and Types

Cremer's understanding of revelation as historical event was combined with an awareness that in certain parts of Scripture much use is made of picture-language. In this respect Cremer probably owes something to the Wuerttemberg Pietist Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782) with whose works he was well-acquainted.⁴ In his exposition of the Psalms

1 Cremer, ET, p. 322.

2 Ibid., p. 832.

3 Ibid., p. 872.

4 Oetinger's exegesis was remarkably good, but he spoiled it by mixing it with theosophical speculation. It is interesting to note that he was the author of a Biblisches und emblematisches Woerterbuch (1776), although Cremer never mentions this work. Oetinger's lexicon was planned as a polemic against the rationalistic exegesis of W. A. Teller, Woerterbuch des N. T. zur Erklaerung der christl. Lehre (1772). (See Reuss, History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, p. 596.).

Oetinger called attention to the metaphorical modes of expression. One should not treat these as mere figures of speech but should revere the reality which underlies them, for through these images God speaks to us.¹ In his exposition of Isaiah 40-66 he pointed out that the working of the Holy Spirit is to be seen not so much in the style as in the poetic, prophetic imagery. The emblematic, theatrical expressions of the prophets are the artistry of the Holy Spirit. The picture which is sketched out only briefly by Isaiah appears in all its fullness in the New Testament.²

Cremer's sermons are rich in biblical imagery. He often allowed Old Testament prophetic images to mingle with images from the New Testament. In a sermon on Isaiah 9.2-7 he describes how the prophet gives names to the Child whom he sees from afar:

The prophet does not see the Lord at the right hand of God as John saw him; he does not see the Conqueror of death, the Victorious Prince upon a white horse, His eyes like flames of fire and many crowns upon His head. Before his eyes he sees a Child lying, and the names he hears, or which he himself gives to the Child, do not signify what the Child will one day become, but what He is, even as He lies there . . . Yes, the Child there is the Saviour.³

1 F. C. Oetinger, Saemmtliche Schriften, hrsg. K. C. E. Ehmann (Stuttgart, 1860), III, 499. Concerning his Woerterbuch Oetinger wrote: "Die ganze Schrift ist voll sinnlicher Vorstellungen, und diese machen das Meiste im neuen Testament aus.

"Diss ist die Haupt-Absicht Gottes, weil Gott geoffenbart ist im Fleisch, durch die Auferstehung Jesu Alles koerperlich und sinnlich vor aller Creatur darzustellen, wie die Stadt Gottes (Off. 21.22) ganz sinnlich ist. Deswegen schreibe ich ein anderes Woerterbuch als Teller, und zeige, dass die Sinnlichkeit der Schrift die Haupt-Absicht Gottes ist. . . . Da sind die sinnlichen Vorstellungen lauter juedische Wort-Spiele; und diss ist der Haupt-Irrthum unserer Zeit. Man muss ganz anders denken, und den woertlichen Ausdruck Christi in den Propheten nicht von der Sinnlichkeit ausleeren." K.C.E. Ehmann, Friedrich Christoph Oetingers Leben und Briefe (Stuttgart, 1859), pp. 322 f.

2 Oetinger, op. cit., pp. 565 f.

3 Hermann Cremer, Troestet mein Volk! Alttestamentliche Predigten, hrsg. E. Cremer (Guetersloh, 1909), p. 25.

God's mighty act in the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt was for Cremer a foreshadowing and a guarantee of eternal redemption. One of his favourite images was the burning bush (Ex. 3.1 ff.) which he took to be a sign of the mystery of God's grace whereby we are judged and yet redeemed:

The Lord is the fire, the Lord in His holiness, and Israel . . . was a useless thorn bush, fit only for burning, not only in the eyes of the Egyptians, not only in the eyes of Moses, but also before God in whom alone their hope lay, and yet they had forsaken Him. . . The thorn bush is Israel's image and our image, the image of the world which God the Lord in His wonderful grace does not wish to destroy but to save.¹

Images appear also in Cremer's Woerterbuch, but not with the same freedom as in his sermons. Most of them are from the Book of Revelation in which there is a rich concentration and fusion of many Old Testament images. There is, for example, the tremendous vision in Revelation, chapters 4 and 5. The four living creatures which surround God's throne may represent the creation in its proper state before God, free from the corruption of sin (Rev. 4.6-9; cf. Ezek. 1.5 f.; Ps. 99.1).² The twenty-four elders may symbolize Israel and the Church (Rev. 4.4-10; cf. Is. 24.23).³ The Lamb (Rev. 5.6 ff.) was a familiar image in the world of Jewish apocalyptic. In the Pseudepigrapha (Eth. Enoch, Test. of the XII Patriarchs Joseph) the lamb appears as a symbol for the all-seeing, all-powerful ruler. The seven horns and the seven eyes suggest power

1 Ibid., p. 57.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 274.

3 Cremer-Koegel, p. 968.

and knowledge. Merging with this apocalyptic image is the image of the sacrificial lamb (Is. 53, Jn. 1.29).¹ The marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19.7-9) is reminiscent of the Old Testament imagery in which God's relation to Israel is pictured as the relation between husband and wife (Hos. 2.19 ff., Is. 54.4-6; Jer. 16). "The marriage of the Lamb is the consummation of salvation to be ushered in by the Parousia."²

Austin Farrer, in a stimulating series of lectures delivered under the title The Glass of Vision, contends that biblical theology cannot be set down as though it were so many logical propositions or concepts, nor does it consist primarily of theological formulae, confessional statements, liturgical forms, and the like. The objectively theological content of the Bible should be sought rather in the images of prophetic and apostolic inspiration. God's redemptive acts evoke images in the minds of the biblical writers, and these images together with the events which evoked them constitute revelation. One cannot coerce these images or systematize them; they are simply there as a living, dynamic work of the Holy Spirit:

. . . each image will have its own conceptual conventions, proper to the figure it embodies: and a single over-all conceptual analysis will be about as useful

1 Ibid., p. 167.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 666. In a letter to Kaehler dated 3rd March 1862 Cremer cited a passage from Oetinger: "'Im A. T. sind die Wortfiguren u. sinnlichen Ausdruecke haeufiger; im N. T. aber quellen mehr Lebensfiguren aus dem Geist; diese haben eine Wunderkraft u. unbeschreibliche Schoenheit, das Leben nicht nur, wo es moeglich waere, abzumalen, sondern mit einer gleichen Empfindlichkeit in des andern Herzen anzuzuenden oder reg zu machen darum kann auch kein Mensch Gottes die ganze Schreibart von einem andern entlehnen, sondern jeder redet aus seiner eignen Fuelle u. Quelle, nach dem Masse der gliedlichen, obwohl ihm selbst unbekannten Verhaeltnis an dem Leib Christi.'" Kaehler, Wie Hermann Cremer wurde? BFTH, VIII, 1 (1904), p. 23.

for the interpretation of the Apostle's writings as a bulldozer for the cultivation of a miniature landscape garden. The various images are not, of course, unconnected in the Apostle's mind, they attract one another and tend to fuse, but they have their own way of doing this, according to their own imagery laws, and not according to the principles of conceptual system.¹

Farrer's observations are most interesting in the light of what we have learned from Oetinger and Cremer. The whole question of prophetic-apostolic imagery has been neglected by scientific biblical scholarship, chiefly because it has been the happy hunting ground for so much fanciful speculation. These tentative investigations by Farrer suggest that, if due caution is exercised, this may be a fruitful approach to biblical theology.

One cannot proceed very far in search of biblical images without encountering the thorny problems connected with a so-called typological interpretation of Scripture. There can be no doubt that Cremer's interpretation of Scripture was in a certain sense typological. According to Cremer the history of Israel is prophetic in character; the Old Testament deals with persons and events which are types of the future.² This is no mere accident. The divinely-appointed institutions of Israel belong to a historical and theological continuum which reached its culmination with

1 Austin Farrer, The Glass of Vision (London, 1948), p. 45. Cf. Farrer, A Rebirth of Images, the Making of St. John's Apocalypse (London, 1949), p. 7: "There appeared to be in several parts of this book a more continuous, hard-headed and systematic working out of O. T. themes than had been recognized . . . p. 17: Since the process is of the rebirth of images, it is to the matrix of images, the O. T., that the Spirit continually leads; for here are the images awaiting rebirth; all this is Christ, could we but see how and why; the Spirit will teach us."

2 Hermann Cremer, Weissagung und Wunder im Zusammenhange der Heilsgeschichte, BFTH, IV, 3 (1900), p. 38.

the advent of the Messiah.¹ Israel's priests, prophets, and kings are committed to uphold the Law of God as it is embodied in the institutions which they represent. Insofar as they are true to their calling they come into conflict with the power of sin, and through their suffering, their fate, or their success, they foreshadow the One who should come.² The ceremonial law was instituted in order that a disobedient Israel might remain in the covenant and continue under God's grace. Thus it came about that "sacrifice and priesthood, which belong inseparably together, stand in typical relation to the One who should come to take away all sins".³ It is not difficult to see how the traditions connected with King David gave rise to prophecies about another David of the future, or how the elect nation itself, the nation which was destined to bring salvation to the world, should be a prefiguration of the Messiah. The "Servant of Yahweh"⁴ (Is. 53) may be the prophet, or Israel, or indeed the Messiah. No portion of the Old Testament is cited more frequently in the New than the 22nd Psalm. It does not essentially matter whether this Psalm originally referred to one man and came later to apply to the nation as a whole, nor does it matter whether the author meant it to be Messianic. In any case the sufferings depicted were being lived out by Israel. The words of this Psalm apply to the Messiah as they apply to no one else, for they describe the only way by which the world could be saved from sin and death.⁵

1 Ibid., p. 41.

2 Ibid., p. 42.

3 Ibid., pp. 43 f.

4 Ibid., p. 42.

5 Ibid., p. 41.

Here is a passage from one of Cremer's sermons which illustrates the way in which he related Old Testament texts to Christ:

Joseph is a type of Christ, like all men of God whom God has chosen, that by His holy counsel and will they should serve men and prepare the people for the revelation of redemption. Some are types through their suffering, others through their action - Isaac, in that he was willing to let himself be sacrificed; Moses, in that he interceded for his people; David, in his suffering and his victory over his enemies; Samuel, as the prince of peace. Joseph is a type of Christ in that through what he has suffered ¹ from his brothers he has become their helper and deliverer. . .

The Old Testament types can be seen only in retrospect, after Christ has completed His work. It was only after the Resurrection that Jesus' own words about His sufferings and death became clear. No one quite understood in advance how it was that the Messianic prophecies were to be fulfilled. Even as He fulfilled them Jesus was misunderstood and rejected by His own disciples. On the road to Emmaus (Lk. 24.25 ff.) He recapitulated the whole Old Testament witness concerning atonement and ² divine redemption.

Typological interpretation of the Old Testament is not a substitute for careful historical research. "It is our task," said Cremer, "not merely to keep the contemporary historical meaning and the Messianic meaning separate, but to perceive both in such a way that we can exhibit the ³ seam, so to speak, where they join together!" One must not dissociate the typological meaning from the contemporary historical meaning. In the time of the Synagogue a whole group of prophetic utterances which were intended to be understood in relation to contemporary events were applied to the

1 Cremer, Troestet mein Volk, pp. 132 f.

2 Cremer, op. cit., p. 41.

3 Ibid., p. 44.

time of the Messiah and given a decidedly eschatological significance. This could only have happened at a time when the whole typical significance of Israel's history was very much in the forefront. If we look upon Israel's election and history as something unique and interpret these in the light of the appearance of the Messiah, we are following in the footsteps of the Fathers of the Reformation.¹ But sometimes our reforming Fathers became so engrossed in Messianic interpretation that they forgot the historical context, and, like others before them, they were guilty of allegorizing.

In the Woerterbuch Cremer was careful to distinguish between typology and allegory:

With the Alexandrine Greeks, and through them with the Alexandrine Jews likewise, ἀλλυγορεῖν, ἀλλυγορίαν are technical names for that philosophy espoused by Aristobulus, and especially by Philo, which regards the Greek myths and the O. T. narratives, theophanies, anthropomorphisms, etc., partly as an unreal clothing, partly as an historical embodiment of moral and religious ideas. . . . It is a significant fact that we find in Philo but a very small residuum of Messianic views, and that neither the person nor the name of the Messiah is to be found in him . . .²

1 Ibid., p. 44. Cremer is probably thinking of Luther, Melancthon, Flacius, and other Lutheran exegetes of the Reformation Period. Cf. Reuss, op. cit., pp. 565 f.: ". . . particularly in the Old Testament, the explanation of which was to be sought in the New, the allegorical interpretation was often regarded as the only acceptable one." Neither Luther nor Melancthon "any more than their successors had a clear idea of the allegorical interpretation, which they at the same time combated and practiced."

2 Cremer, ET, pp. 96 f.

If the historical note in the Apostolic proclamation is taken seriously, there is no room left for allegory. That frame of mind which is conducive to allegorizing is out of keeping with biblical modes of thought. It is indeed true that in one well known passage St. Paul declares that he is interpreting allegorically (Gal. 4.22 ff.), and yet this is not quite like Alexandrian allegory:

. . . Gal. iv. 22 sqq. belongs at least to that class of allegorical interpretations wherein the matter of fact is retained as an embodiment of the idea, as an embodiment which belongs to actual history, where, therefore, allegory and type meet. Whereas the Philonic method knows nothing of the type as an historical prefiguring of future history, and infers or abstracts only general truths, moral or religious, from the historical fact by allegorizing, the apostle's aim is to prove, by the fact he cites, a certain law in the history of redemption which underlies that history from its beginning to its close.¹

In the Pauline Epistles the word τύπος is "used to signify a prophetic type, i. e. an image or similitude which is essentially intended as a type or pattern. Thus of Adam, Rom. v. 14, 'ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος', 1 Cor. x. 6, 11". In the New Testament the word² was used differently from the way in which it is now. An ἀντίτυπος³

1 Ibid., p. 97.

2 Ibid., p. 557. Cf. Torm, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments, pp. 222 f.: "Wenn der unter der Wuestenwanderung vorkommende Wasser spendende Fels (1. Kor. 10,4) auf Christus gedeutet wird, koennte das eher als eine Allegorie im eigentlichen Sinne bezeichnet werden. Wir befinden uns aber hier in einem Textzusammenhang, in dem den Ereignissen der Wuestenwanderung eine vorbildliche ('typische' - τυπικῶς 1. Kor. 10.11) Bedeutung fuer die Gegenwart zugeschrieben wird . . ."

3 In modern usage type is to antitype what symbol is to reality. The type is the copy and the antitype is the original. In New Testament and Patristic Greek, however, "τύπος is the pre-figuration, ἀντίτυπος the copy which answers to the original, and thus τύπος as compared with ἀντίτυπος is the prototype . . . But τύπος is κατ' εἶδος the pattern or prefigurement, and ἀντίτυπος is not opposed to this but to the ἀρχέτυπος. . ." Cremer, ET, p. 892.

was an image, not a precise copy; it was a likeness, a similitude, but not an exact counterpart. "So in Heb. ix. 24, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν¹ 1 Pet. iii. 21, of the water of baptism as the image . . . of the waters of the flood, which were the means of saving Noah and his family." The situation is summed up in a statement by Delitzsch which Cremer quoted with approval: "all Old Testament types are copies of which the Messiah² is the original".

The biblical images and types must always be viewed in connection with history, redemptive history; otherwise they become what Austin Farrer³ so aptly termed "shadows on the clouds".

1 Ibid., p. 557.

2 Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 653. Cf. Torm, op. cit., pp. 224 f.: "Als Beispiele fuer die vielen im N. T. herangezogenen Typen aus dem A. T. koennen angefuehrt werden; Adam als Typus fuer Christus, Roem. 5,12 ff.; vgl. 1 Kor. 15,45; der Prophet Elias als Typus fuer Johannes den Taeufer, Matth. 11,14 und 17,12 Sara wird als Typus der neutesamentlichen Gemeinde betrachtet (Gal. 4,22 ff., vgl. 1. Pet. 3,6). . . . 'Die neutest. Allegorie, wie sie hier Paulus gebraucht, ist nichts anderes als der typische Sinn', Tholuck: Das Alte Test. im N. T., S. 39."

3 Farrer, op. cit., p. 43. Cf. E. von Dobschuetz, "The Bible in the Church," Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. II, pp. 581, 597: "There is a reciprocal effect of prophecy and fulfilment which gives rise to typology. . . . In contradistinction to philosophical speculations which disregarded history, Christianity was by its whole nature bound up with history. The notion of prophecy and fulfilment took the place of the Platonic noumenon and phainomenon. Thus it came about that the history of Christian exegesis is a conflict between a historical interpretation and the old allegorical method." Cf. Dilthey, "Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik," pp. 193 f.; also Weber, op. cit., pp. 340 f.

CHAPTER V

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AS "HEILSGESCHICHTE"

The Origins of the "Redemptive History" School

In a monograph entitled Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes, Cremer gives a concise definition of Heilsgeschichte:

God's self-manifestation for our redemption has a history which begins with the preservation of the sinful world, finds its mid-point in the revelation of God in Christ, and reaches its conclusion in the judgment of righteousness which powerfully saves the congregation of the elect. It is a unified action of God, not through history but within history, in humanity . . .¹

Where did Cremer get this conception? We have already noted that redemptive history is indigenous to Scripture itself. The prophets and apostles bear witness to a particular history, to events which have redemptive significance. And yet this aspect of biblical thought appears to have made very little impression upon the Fathers of the Early Church. Irenaeus was the one notable exception. Oscar Cullmann states that until the nineteenth century "there has scarcely been another theologian who has recognized so clearly as did Irenaeus that the Christian proclamation stands or falls with the redemptive history, that the historical work of Jesus Christ as Redeemer forms the mid-point of a line which leads from

¹ Hermann Cremer, Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes, BFTh, I, 4 (1897), p. 110.

the Old Testament to the return of Christ.¹

The covenant theology developed by Reformed theologians in the sixteenth century has a bearing upon the later conception of redemptive history. According to Gottlob Schrenk, the first Reformer to make specific use of the biblical idea of the covenant was Zwingli.² He related it to the doctrine of the sacraments in his controversy with the Baptists. Bullinger developed a more detailed concept of the covenant using Zwingli's ideas as his starting-point. Interestingly enough, Bullinger begins his study with an investigation of the meaning of the words ברית, *ברית*.³ He taught that Christ fulfills the covenant with Abraham and that the New Covenant is established through baptism and the Lord's Supper. Calvin also followed Zwingli and Bullinger in regarding the covenant from a redemptive-historical, sacramental standpoint.⁴ Ursinus and Olevian, whose names are associated with the Heidelberg Catechism, gave new vigour to the covenant theology of Bullinger by emphasizing the believer's experience of salvation in the present.⁵ Olevian linked the covenant with the kingly, priestly rule of Christ, and thus allowed the concepts of covenant and kingdom to come together.⁶ Gomarus, Musculus, Polanus, and

1 Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, trans. Floyd V. Filson (London, 1951), pp. 56 f. Cf. G. Ernest Wright, God Who Acts (London, 1952), p. 13: "... Biblical theology is the recital of the redemptive acts of God in a particular history, because history is the chief medium of revelation."

2 Gottlob Schrenk, Gottesreich und Bund im aelteren Protestantismus, vornehmlich bei Johannes Coccejus (Guetersloh, 1923), pp. 36 ff.

3 Ibid., p. 40.

4 Ibid., p. 48.

5 Ibid., pp. 57 ff.

6 Ibid., p. 60.

Wolleb consolidated these dogmatic gains and developed a doctrine of a double covenant (a covenant of works and a covenant of grace).

The theology of the covenants was given its definitive formulation by Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669). His principle systematic work, Summa doctrina de foedere et testamento Dei, begins with a long exposition of the meaning of foedus and ברית.¹ Cocceius divided biblical history into three dispensations in which the covenant of grace progressively superseded the covenant of works. The first economy, ante legem, began with the proclamation of the Protoevangelium in paradise and extended through the age of the Patriarchs; the second economy, sub lege, covered the period from Moses to Christ; the third economy, post legem, was the time of the Church in which the history of the Kingdom of God was unfolded in seven periods corresponding to the seven letters, the seven seals, and the seven trumpets in the Apocalypse. According to the Reformed view, the Old Testament saints already possessed salvation; the redemptive history was but an outward manifestation or unfolding of the eternal decrees.²

1 "Schon hier macht Coccejus darauf aufmerksam, dass der juedisch-hellenistische Gebrauch von διαθήκη im Sinne von testamentarischer Verordnung, wie er auch Gal. 3,5; Hebr. 9,16; 8,10 vorliege, noch eine andere Bedeutung des Bundes lehre: die goettliche Erklaerung gilt als Testament ueber eine Erbschaft, sie ist eine Testamentsverfuegung. Bisher ist der Bund als μονόπλευρον dargestellt worden: die Anordnung Gottes ist dann zu vergleichen mit dem Schalten die Siegers ueber den Besiegten, des Herrn ueber die Knechte. Aber Gottes Bund bleibt nicht einseitig, er wird δίπλευρον, ein wechselseitiger Vertrag, . . . Zur goettlichen stipulatio kommt die menschliche adstipulatio und restipulatio." Schrenk, op. cit., pp. 83 f.

2 H. Heppe, Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der Reformierten Kirche (Leiden, 1879), pp. 218, 222.

A clearly defined theology of redemptive history appears in the eighteenth-century Lutheran Church, particularly in the Wuerttemberg Pietists Bengel and Oetinger.¹ We find it also in Dr. Samuel Collenbusch who was a key figure among the Pietists of the Rhineland in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Ritschl, in his History of Pietism,² traces this back to Cocceius, but Cremer disagrees. Bengel's concept of revelation as history is something quite different from the federal theology of Cocceius. Collenbusch held the same view as the Wuerttemberg Pietists, but he did not get it from them. The question is, where did they all get it? Cremer thinks the answer is to be found in the "biblical histories" which were prepared by the Lutherans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as an aid to catechetical instruction (e. g., Huebner, Biblische Historie, 1714; Buddeus, Historia ecclesiastica Vet. Test., 1715; G. A. Pauli, Heilshistorie, 1730).³

Schrenk's study makes it quite clear that Cremer has underestimated the influence of Cocceius upon Pietism and upon that theology of redemptive history which Cremer himself propounded. The history of Pietism must be seen in relation to Cocceius. His ideas find their continuation in Spener and Frank, Bengel and Oetinger, Hofmann and Beck.⁴

1 Karl Hermann, Johann Albrecht Bengel (Stuttgart, 1937), p. 369.

2 A. Ritschl, Geschichte des Pietismus (Bonn, 1880), I, 565.

3 Aus dem Nachlass eines Gottesgelehrten, Aufsätze, Briefe und Tagebuchblätter von Dr. Samuel Collenbusch, hrsg. Hermann Cremer (Stuttgart, 1902), p. 19. The same material is also found in Cremer's article, "Collenbusch," PRE, IV, p. 239.

4 "Es handelt sich bei einer Ermittlung der coccejanischen Theologie

The strongest influence in the development of Cremer's own concept of Heilsgeschichte came from Dr. Samuel Collenbusch (1724-1803). Collenbusch, who was a layman, endeavored more earnestly than any theologian of his time to derive his theology from Scripture and to measure every doctrine and opinion against Scripture.¹ Unhampered by phantasy or the fertility of his own ideas "he knew no other task than to compare Scripture with Scripture," and thus he arrived at what amounted to a system although he never laboured to construct one.² Collenbusch found God's holiness and righteousness expressed in the love with which He humbled Himself and gave Himself to man. Thus he combined a high Christology with a thoroughgoing kenosis. The questions with which Collenbusch and the Wuerttemberg Pietists were most concerned were: God's plan of redemption, the doctrine of reconciliation, the future of the Church,³ and the conversion of the Jews. God requires righteousness

um nichts Geringeres als dies, die historischen Wurzeln der eschatologisch abgezielten Geschichtsbetrachtung des Pietismus, der Bengelschen Auffassung von der Schrift als einem organischen System, der Lehre Collenbuschs, Hasenkamps, Menkens und der Erlanger 'Heilsgeschichte' blosszulegen." Schrenk, op. cit., vii. "H. Cremer hat mit grosser Bestimmtheit ausgesprochen: 'Weder die Wuerttemberger noch Collenbusch haben irgendwelche Anregungen von Coccejus oder den Coccejanern her empfangen.' But he overlooked the fact that the influence of Cocceius' biblical scholarship had penetrated deep into the Lutheran camp and that even after many generations his theology still had a powerful effect upon the pulpit. Ibid., pp. 305, 318 f.

1 Cremer, Collenbusch's Nachlass, p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 11.

3 Ibid., p. 11. Cf. Ritschl, op. cit., p. 565.

and works to effect righteousness. That, according to Collenbusch, is¹ the key to the mystery of the ways of God from beginning to end. Biblical history, and indeed all history, reached its climax when Christ came and now moves on toward its end. The idea of a redemptive history was taken up by Collenbusch's friends and admirers, notably by Hasenkamp and Menken. So strong was the influence of Collenbusch upon Menken that the latter² appears never to have had an original thought of his own. Krafft, a Reformed pastor and professor at Erlangen, was a product of the Collenbusch-Hasenkamp circle, and through him the idea of a Heilsgeschichte found its way into the theology of J. C. K. von Hofmann and the Erlangen School. Cremer believed that Thomasius' "Kenosis," Hofmann's "Heilsgeschichte," and Hoefling's doctrine of the sacraments could be traced back to Collenbusch; indeed the whole Erlangen doctrine of sanctification and the experience of salvation, which was given final formulation in Frank's "new I", came from thence. Thus the influence of³ Collenbusch penetrated deep into the theology of the nineteenth century.

1 Cremer, PRE, IV, 238. "Die Bibel hat keinen terminum a quo (Anfangspunkt), wenn man die drei ersten Kapitel des Buchs Mose abstuemmelt, und keinen terminum ad quem (Zielpunkt), wenn man die drei letzten Kapitel der Offenbarung Johannes abstuemmelt.

Die drei ersten Kapitel handeln von der Schoepfung, vom Suendenfall, und vom verheissenen Weibsamem.

Die drei letzten Kapitel handeln vom juengsten Gerichte. . . in welchem Gott den unermesslichen Reichtum seiner Herrlichkeit am allerherrlichsten geoffenbart hat." Collenbusch, "Ueber die Apokalypse oder Offenbarung Johannes," Nachlass, p. 51.

2 Cremer, Collenbusch's Nachlass, p. 22. "Fuer Menken die Bibel nicht ein Lehrbuch war, sondern das goettliche Zuegniss von den vergangenen, gegenwaertigen und zukuenftigen Thatfachen einer Heilsgeschichte in deren Mittelpunkte Christus steht." E.F.K. Mueller, PRE, XII, 583.

3 Cremer, Collenbusch's Nachlass, p. 23. Cf. PRE, IV, 240 ff. "Biblizismus ist ohne vorausgehende Foederaltheologie undenkbar. . . . Collenbusch, Hasenkamp, Menken setzen die heilsgeschichtliche Linie fort." Gottlob Schrenk, RGG, I, 1366.

Cremer is not dependent upon the Erlangen School for his concept of redemptive history; he derived it directly from Collenbusch, Bengel, and Oetinger, and perhaps also from his teacher Beck. Whereas the Erlangen School accepted Collenbusch's doctrine of justification and sanctification, Cremer did not. Despite his many remarkable insights into biblical theology, Collenbusch erred in his conception of sanctification. He held that one advanced toward moral-religious perfection by progressive stages. He forgot that even the believer is a sinner who needs to be forgiven ever and again. The point which Collenbusch and so many others with him had overlooked was that, so long as we are in the flesh, we have to do with sin, and the struggle between flesh and spirit continues.¹ During his student days Cremer went to Erlangen to hear von Hofmann and surprised his friends by reporting that he had² heard nothing new.

1 "Collenbusch fasst den Begriff der Vollkommenheit als die zur Vollendung gediehene sittliche, bzw. sittlich-religioese Entwicklung, und denkt nicht daran, dass z. B. Paulus Phil. 3,12 die 'Vollkommenheit' fuer sich als noch nicht erreicht aussagt . . ." Cremer, Collenbusch's Nachlass, p. 17. (Collenbusch was influenced by the philosophy of Leibnitz; the Wuerttemberg Pietists were also.) "Dazu kommen nun noch die in der Erlanger Schule so gut wie gar nicht zur Geltung gekommenen Versuche einer neuen Fassung der biblischen Begriffe der Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit Gottes, an denen freilich der Auffassung der Heiligkeit als der 'Demut Gottes' und die der Gerechtigkeit nach Analogie des griechischen und mittelalterlichen Begriffs als 'proportionierlichen Liebe' irrig ist, waehrend die Betonung der spezifisch israelitischen Erkenntnis durchaus den richtigen Weg weist." Cremer, ibid., p. 23.

2 Ernest Cremer, "Mitteilungen ueber den Lebensgang und Heimgang von Hermann Cremer," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblaetter, p. 127.

Cremer, no less than Beck, von Hofmann, Auberlen, and Kaehler, deserves a place among the nineteenth-century advocates of a theology of redemptive history.¹ His conception of Heilsgeschichte is most fully set forth in his monograph Weissagung und Wunder im Zusammenhange der Heilsgeschichte, and the information supplied there may be supplemented with material from the Woerterbuch and other of his writings.

Israel's History as Redemptive History

In Cremer's time it was the fashion to regard biblical theology from the standpoint of evolution; Hegelianism in philosophy and Darwinianism in natural science had made a profound impression upon biblical scholarship. But Cremer, who found himself in opposition to so much of the theological thinking of his time, declared that Scripture could not properly be interpreted according to the principle of evolution. One might very well find in the Old Testament a progressive growth of religious consciousness if it were not for one crucial point which had been overlooked by the advocates of the developmental theory, namely, the fact of sin. Because of sin, the law of nature is not the law of progress but the law of sin and death. The history of religion began with man's rejection of God, not with the first dawning consciousness of deity in the mind of primitive man. Man had not gradually learned to know God; on the contrary, he had done his best to forget him.

1 Cullmann, op. cit., p. 56, has omitted Cremer from his list of theologians of the "redemptive history" school.

Paganism first becomes possible when man has forgotten God.¹ The worship of nature deities could never lead to knowledge of the true God, for these gods were man's own invention. All logical, moral reflection can only lead to the conclusion that God must destroy the creature who has rebelled against Him, but God stands in direct contradiction to all our ideas about Him. He reveals Himself as One who has² compassion upon us and redeems us.

The reality of revelation - that is what the Christian sees when he looks at the Old Testament tradition. He sees the divine Hand at work in history, but the scholar who approaches Scripture with his own critical presuppositions will be concerned chiefly with sources, literary strata, and the growth of religious ideas. The Christian who looks at Scripture in the light of his faith can render a different judgment. The power to believe is God's gift; God Himself through His Holy Spirit helps us to believe. Faith is "the gift of the God who has³ begun His good work in us and who will also complete it". Israel's religion is not a product of the human spirit.

Although Cremer insisted upon the objectivity of revelation, he did not thereby repudiate the historico-critical method. He appears to have accepted Wellhausen's literary criticism of the Pentateuch, in

1 Hermann Cremer, Weissagung und Wunder im Zusammenhange der Heilsgeschichte, BFTb, IV, 3 (1900), pp. 13-14, 18-19.

2 Ibid., p. 15.

3 "Ueberall liegt die Initiative auf Seiten Gottes. Gott ist es, der sich in seiner wunderbaren Herrlichkeit geoffenbart hat, - Gott ist es, der den Glauben in uns wirkt . . . Von hier aus ergiebt sich uns rueckwärts, dass wir . . . keinen Grund haben, den Berichten zu misstrauen, welche auch die Religion Israels auf goetliche Initiative zurueckfuehren . . ." Ibid., p. 16.

the main at least. The issues which engrossed the literary critics and the religious historians were simply secondary so far as he was concerned.¹ He felt that there was a grave weakness in Wellhausen's position when it came to the matter of origins. The earliest Old Testament traditions indicate that the beginning of Israel's history and the beginning of Israel's religion are inseparably bound up together. Wellhausen leaves Israel's history unaccounted for until well into the period of the kings. He cannot account for the origin of Israelite religion nor does he offer a satisfactory explanation of prophecy or of the Law and its significance.² The traditions from the most primitive period in Israel's history are indeed scanty and fragmentary, like great boulders washed down from a mountainside, and they have been interwoven with saga. Yet, on the whole, the biblical writers have preserved what is pertinent to the history between God and man. They tell how sin came into the world, and they relate how God chose Abraham

1 "Wohl sind es nur Bruchstuecke, die uns durch die alttestamentliche Ueberlieferung aufbehalten sind, und zwar Bruchstuecke, welche noch deutlich die verschiedenen Kreise, denen sie entstammen, und die Haende, die sie redigiert und uns ueberliefert haben, erkennen lassen. Aber diese Bruchstuecke verlieren weder dadurch an Glaubwuerdigkeit, . . . noch wird ihre Glaubwuerdigkeit erschuettert durch den in ihnen herrschenden religioesen Gesichtspunkt." Ibid., p. 17.

2 Ibid., pp. 13, 17. Cf. G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment (London, 1950), pp. 13 ff.: "How did Israel become a nation with such faith in its God that its very existence was conceived to be a miracle of grace? . . . What was that something in early Israel which predisposed and predetermined the course of Biblical history? . . . Even Wellhausen, the great pathfinder of the developmental history, often used to admit: 'Why Chemosh of Moab never became the God of righteousness and the Creator of heaven and earth, is a question to which one can give no satisfactory answer.'"

to be the tribal ancestor of the nation destined to be the instrument¹ of God's salvation.

"There is," says Cremer, "a factor at work in Israel's history which is lacking in the history of the nations, and thereby it becomes² Heilsgeschichte." On no account may God's self-manifestation to Israel be understood as a progressive revelation, nor is it an unveiling³ of heretofore hidden knowledge in the form of ideas about God. In Scripture revelation is something else. "It is the self-manifestation of God in the history of His people . . . The only principle by which God's revelation or self-manifestation takes place is the one given⁴ by Paul: 'where sin abounded, grace did much more about'."

Viewed from this standpoint, Old Testament theology must be⁵ something more than the history of Israel's religion. If Israel's

1 Ibid., p. 19. "Mit der israelitischen Urgeschichte haengt fuer uns auch die Glaubwuerdigkeit der Ueberlieferungen aus der Urzeit zusammen, wenn wir auch in verschiedenen Punkten die Thatsachen nicht mehr so erkennbar machen koennen, dass wir uns eine deutliche Vorstellung von ihnen machen koennen." Ibid., p. 18.

2 Ibid., p. 25.

3 Ibid., p. 22. Cf. Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 45: "Bezeichnet es die Unterschiedenheit Gottes von allem, was sonst ist, so wird damit ein Gegensatz zwischen Gott u. Welt ausgedrueckt. . . . Dass dieser Gegensatz aber fuer Israel kein anderer ist, als der Gegensatz Gottes zur suendigen Welt oder zu Suende u. zu allem, was mit derselben zusammenhaengt, u. dass an diesem Gegensatze Geschichte u. Prophetie, das Gesetz u. das relig. Leben Israels ihren Mittelpunkt haben, kann nicht verkannt werden, mag man ueber die Entwicklung des Bewusstseins um diesen Gegensatz denken, wie man will."

4 Ibid., pp. 22 f.

5 "Die Entwicklung der Religion Israels ist nicht eine Entwicklung von irgend einer Stufe oder Gestalt des Heidentums aus zum Monotheismus

history is the product of the natural factors operative in folklore, religion, and the growth of culture, then Jesus is nothing more than a product of the Jewish national common life. If that be so, then His Cross and Resurrection mean something totally different to what they meant to the Apostles, and one might as well accept this new form of the "Goethe cult," the "cult of the genius" in place of historic Christianity. Either Jesus is merely another high aspiration of the human spirit or¹ He is really what the New Testament says He is.

Promise and Fulfilment

The law of development which is valid for nature and history at large does not govern Heilsgeschichte. God is under no moral or logical obligation whatever so far as man is concerned; salvation is a totally free act of God's love. Old Testament prophecy, which is part of the Heilsgeschichte, rests upon this absolute freedom of God. Prophecy has no analogy in nature; it cannot be compared to that natural unfolding in which "the seed, the bud is a prediction of leaves, blossoms, and fruit, which appear according to the law of development . . ." Within the prophetic Heilsgeschichte is that divine factor, that factor which is inaccessible to "scientific" historical research. "God discloses

bezw. zur Erkenntnis der Transscendenz Gottes, in welcher dann wieder ein Irrtum stecken soll, den Christus ueberwunden hat. Die alttestamentliche Theologie ist weder eine Foederaltheologie im Sinne des Coccejus noch eine Entwicklung vom Mosaismus zum Prophetismus . . ." Ibid., p. 23. Cremer has rightly perceived that the Cocceian federal theology may easily become a form of evolution.

2 Ibid., p. 21.

Himself ever more fully in the whole wonderful greatness of His love

¹ . . ." Prophecy does not consist principally in the foretelling of this or that future event; it is rather the prior proclamation of salvation. Prophecy in this sense occurs only in Israel.²

The fundamental point upon which understanding of revelation, prophecy, and miracle turns is the Fall. Man, who was created in the image of God, "has set himself in contradiction with the principle and goal of his life," so that he "can only trace his present sinful existence back to a Fall, to a fateful act of opposition against the will of his God".³ But God has not abandoned us to our fate. He lets us find Him again in Christ and through Christ we learn why God spared man after the Fall.

One requires certainty, else he could not believe, and this certainty has to do with historical facts although it cannot be attained by historical knowledge alone. The Protoevangelium was designed to provide this kind of certainty:

. . . the promise includes an act of God within itself. . . The act of God expressed in this promise and executed in the preservation of the world solves the riddle of our existence for us, the fact as well as the goal of our life. We exist for redemption.⁴

1 Ibid., p. 30. "Der Gott der Erloesung kann nicht bloss nicht a priori, sondern auch nicht auf Grund des Natur - und Geschichtszusammenhanges erkannt werden, sondern nur so, dass er sich selbst in seiner Freiheit zu erkennen giebt oder dass er sich offenbart." Ibid., p. 33.

2 Ibid., p. 31.

3 Ibid., p. 34.

4 Ibid., pp. 36-37.

God begins a new history with man, a history in which the principle of ἐκλογὴ¹ is operative. In the world a battle is being waged between good and evil, but it is only human good against human evil; God only intervenes sufficiently to prevent sinful man from gaining total mastery of the world. Within the history of Israel, however,² God sets Himself against the power of evil.

The typological significance of Israel's history, its institutions, and its leaders, is dependent upon the promise of future redemption. God's repeated acts of intervention on behalf of His people were a foreshadowing of final salvation. "Both belong together; the present or imminent deliverance takes place in the power of the future Messianic salvation, and the future Messianic salvation is only the full³ revelation of the already present God who rescues those who are His." Prophecy does not rest upon a natural gift of "second sight" nor upon theological speculation. Insofar as it involves foreknowledge this is based entirely upon the sovereign, redemptive will of God. The promise is fully understood only after it has been fulfilled.

The theme of promise and fulfilment found its way into Cremer's sermons. In a sermon entitled "The Glory of God in Promise and Fulfilment" (I Kings 19.4-18) he said:

How thankfully our first parents received the word concerning the seed of the woman who should crush the head of the serpent. . . . Abraham was chosen out of the midst of a godless world, and he believed in hope where there was nothing to hope for . . . But ever again in the time of sinful corruption and in the darkness of judgment the light of promise shone - and ever again the people turned their back

1 Ibid., p. 37.

2 Ibid., pp. 38 f.

3 Ibid., p. 46.

upon the Lord and forsook Him and forgot Him. . . . And still - under the marvelous patience of God the sins of men ran rampant, as if there were no God and no judgment, that is the preparation for the day of salvation and for the Saviour who says: I am not come to destroy men's lives, but to save. The patience of God has regard for your salvation - that is said already in the Old Covenant, and nothing will make the wonderful greatness and glory of promise and fulfilment, of redemption, clearer to us than this observation. Everywhere we see: not judgment, but grace, the very opposite of what one would think, that is God's will.¹

The Old Testament prophets spoke of judgment, but this was the shadow side of redemption. Judgment always remained subservient to God's saving purpose.² Israel's history was oriented toward the future, and in this sense the whole Old Testament is a book of prophecy.³ It is Israel's history which reaches its goal and end in the Person and history of Jesus.⁴

1 Hermann Cremer, Troestet mein Volk, hrsg. Ernst Cremer (Gutersloh, 1909), pp. 13-14.

2 Cremer, Weissagung und Wunder, p. 47.

3 Ibid., p. 48. "Die Beduetung der Weissagung fuer unsern Glauben liegt aber in der Erfuellung. Sie entstammt dem sich im voraus bindenden Willen Gottes, dem Willen, durch welchen er sich bindet, gegen das Gesetz der Entwicklung, welches fuer uns zum Gesetz der Suende und des Todes geworden ist, uns zu erloesen. . . . Darum gehoert es zu unserm Glauben zu erkennen, dass in Christo alle Gottesverheissungen ja sind und sind Amen in ihm (2 Kor. 1,20)." Ibid., pp. 83-84.

4 Ibid., p. 20. " . . . einfach d. Verhaeltnis von Weissagung u. Erfuellung beruehrt u. d. Tatsache betont, dass d. Idee, sei sie im Wort od. im Symbol niedergelegt, Realitaet geworden ist." Jesus is the culmination of the O. T. history of faith (Heb. 11.1-12.2). " . . . so hat alles Glaubensleben in ihm seine Grundlage u. seinen Abschluss, u. steht er als Anfang u. Ende selber dahinter (Schlatter, Gl. im N. T.³ 535.) D. grosse Glaubensgeschichte hat in ihm, wie ihren Ausgangspunkt, so ihr Ziel." Cremer-Koegel, p. 1049.

Miracles

Events are recorded in Scripture which are clearly contrary to the natural causal connection of things, and these miraculous events form an integral part of the Heilsgeschichte.¹ Miracles are not marvels; they do not take place according to some still undiscovered law of nature. Divine providence does indeed work through natural causality, but miracles are something more than that. Nor are the biblical miracles to be placed on a par with the mythological happenings described in folklore and legend. There is nothing magical about them, for magic involves an attempt to manipulate nature for one's own ends. Within the realm of Heilsgeschichte, on the other hand, there is a clear awareness that the continuity of creaturely causality is unbreakable. It is so impenetrable² that only the power of God's redemptive will can do anything against it. If there were no sin in the world, there would be no need for miracles.³ "But sin is the occasion for the redemptive work." Because "all miracles related to us in Holy Scripture are counteractions against the efficacy of creaturely causalities," they are outside the sphere of knowledge accessible to natural science and historiography. The question of the

1 "Ist die Erlösung das Gegenteil alles Selbstverständes, aller selbst-verständlichen und gewissensmaessigen Folgerichtigkeit des goettlichen Verhaltens, und doch Wirklichkeit, . . . so werden wir von hier aus auch die Erscheinungen begreifen koennen, die wir als Wunder bezeichnen." Cremer, *op. cit.*, pp. 49 f.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 51.

1
reality and possibility of miracles remains a purely religious question.

A biblical miracle is a sign (σημεῖον), an indication² that God is actively at work on behalf of sinful man. In the New Testament signs and wonders are often called δυνάμεις (Mt. 11.20, Mk. 6.2, Lk. 10.13, Acts 2.22, II Cor. 12.12, et al.); "the miraculous³ activity of Christ is traced to the δυνάμεις working in Him". Just as the proclamation of the Old Testament prophets was sometimes accompanied by miracles, so the words of Jesus went hand in hand with His mighty⁴ works. Jesus heals with a word of power which is even mightier than God's word of creation:

"Arise and walk," says Jesus to the sick man at the Pool of Bethesda, . . . and forthwith the man was well; he took up his bed and walked, and in this manner all miracles occur: by a word and in an instant the storm ceases and the sea becomes still. The storm does not abate gradually, the sick man does not receive his strength back little by little. The working of miracles is an action whose only analogy is the creative action of God, only different insofar as it does not thereby call into being that which is not, but as a rule - especially in the miracles of Jesus - it works against a power of destruction with a powerful word, and so accomplishes even more than God's creative word.⁵

The miracles which Jesus performed during His ministry are only isolated instances; they are not a universal, once for all victory over the

1 "Nur wenn der Geschichtsforscher sich auf dieses Gebiet begibt und Stellung genommen hat zu der besonderen Geschichte, die sich hier begeben, kann er ein Urteil gewinnen ueber die Geschichtlichkeit der Wunder, ein Urteil, welches dann aber in engstem Zusammenhange steht mit seinem Urteil ueber die Thatsache das Wesen und den Inhalt der goettlichen Offenbarung ueberhaupt." Ibid., p. 54.

2 Ibid., p. 52. 3 Cremer, ET, p. 220 4 Cremer, op. cit., p. 71.

5 Ibid., pp. 52 f.

forces of evil. "The sick whom He healed were not thereby secured against sickness and death, and Jairus' daughter, and the young man of Nain and Lazarus must still die again."¹ In this sense the miracles remain only signs, but genuine signs nonetheless, for they indicate that Jesus is the Messiah who has come to redeem the world. The miracles themselves do not constitute salvation. The Messiah must suffer and die. In that act the sin of man goes its full length and the sin of the whole world is² forgiven.

Especially at the beginning and concluding realization of salvation is the power of God active and discernible, Luke i. 35; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. xiii. 4 (the birth and resurrection of Christ); and where Paul speaks of the δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ, as in Eph. i. 19, . . . reference is made to the power which manifested itself in the resurrection of Christ which works σωτηρίαν (2 Tim. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 5), and displays itself savingly in and on man . . . In this sense Paul terms the gospel the word³ of the cross, Christ the crucified, the power of God.

The greatest miracles of all are the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection, and these are salvation.

Angels and Supernatural Powers

Cremer believed that the angels which appear in the biblical narratives from time to time should be understood within the context of

1 Ibid., p. 69.

2 Ibid., p. 71. "Dass Jesus Wunder gethan als Zeichen von dem Groesseren was er thun sollte, begreifen wir. Um aber dieses Groessere thun zu koennen, muss er zuvor den Tod leiden. Er ruft Gottes Gericht ueber die Welt nicht an, denn lieber will er selbst leiden, als dass die Welt gerichtet werden soll. So tritt sein Leiden und Sterben an die Stelle des Gerichtes ueber die Welt." Ibid., p. 72.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 220.

Heilsgeschichte. They are "messengers between heaven and earth in the service of God".¹ They accompany the redemptive history at every stage, but do not exert any influence upon man independent of the will of God.

Generally where history is narrated, or prefigured in visions (in the Revelation), they occupy their appropriate place . . . They are λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν Heb. 1. 14, - this is the view of the position, significance, and appearing of angels . . . which runs throughout Holy Scripture, so that their service . . . is for the benefit of those for whom God has provided salvation.²

They also have to do with the disturbances of nature which accompany the mighty acts of God.³ Some commentators have taken the expression αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν in Mt. 24.29 to be a reference to the angel world, but Cremer thinks it refers to "those supramundane powers by means of which the (natural) heavenly world exerts its influence upon the earth".⁴ "Ἡ δὺν τῶν οὐρ. denotes, indeed, in Ps. xxxii. 6, Dan. viii. 10, plural in Isa. xxxiv. 4, the starry host, " but one should not infer from this that the stars were regarded as living beings or that they were identified with the angels."⁵

In both Testaments mention is made frequently of a whole multitude of angels, the heavenly host.

1 Ibid., p. 20.

2 Ibid., p. 22.

3 ". . . wie Gott in sonderlichen Weise seinen Knecht errettet hat, ganz wie die Errettung Israels aus Aegypten Ps. 68, 8 ff. 77, 16 ff. die Gesetzgebung auf dem Sinai Ex. 19, 16; Hbr. 12,18, u. die Parusie Hab. 3; Lc. 21,25; 2 Th. 1,8 nicht ohne Begleiterscheinung in der Natur erfolgten." Cremer, "Engel," PRE, V, 365 f.

4 Cremer, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Matt. 24.25 (Stuttgart, 1860), p. 105.

5 Cremer, ET, p. 219.

"These members of the στρατὸν οὐράνιον are designed . . . to glorify God; see Ps. ciii. 20; Eph. i. 14; and, moreover, in such a way that in them especially the omnipotence and resplendent majesty of God are reflected (cf. the very term στρατὸν οὐράνιον and God's title מַלְאָכָיו הַקְּדוֹשִׁים). . . .¹ Where the appearance of Christ, μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως is spoken of, Matt. xxiv. 30, Mark xiii. 26, Luke xxi. 27, we may conceive the δυνάμεις as represented by the accompanying hosts of angels, who, like an army, . . . are designated δυνάμεις τοῦ κυρίου Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2 = הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ.²

Angels appear "at the outset of N. T. history, and at the resurrection and ascension of Christ . . . And they appear again in the future at the end of the history of salvation . . ."³

In the Old Testament we encounter the idea of the Adversary (יְהוֹשָׁפָט) "who appears among the ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ before God, opponent of the יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ" (I Chron. 21.1; Job. 1.6-12, 2.1-6; Zech. 3.1 f.). He is the antagonist of man, but is not alienated from God.⁴ Later, in the Intertestamental period, the devil is portrayed as a fallen angel (Enoch, Book of Jubilees, Test. of XII Patr.) against whom the final battle will be fought at the "end of days". In the New Testament the devil has "power to influence man, and that, too, in opposition to God and His influences" (Mt. 13.38 ff.; I Jn. 3.8, 10; Eph. 2.2).⁵ Satan is the "ruler of this world" (Jn. 12.31,

1 Ibid., p. 20. "Denn von Anfang an ist die Erscheinung des Engeldienstes ein Wohlthat Gottes . . . Daraus bildet sich die namentlich in dichterischer Sprache verwendete vorstellung von den Jhvh umgebenden Myriaden." Cremer, PRE, V, 368.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 219.

3 Ibid., p. 23. Cf. PRE V, p. 368.

4 Ibid., p. 121. Cf. Cremer-Koegel, p. 188.

5 Ibid., p. 121.

14.30, 16.11), "the god of this age" (II Cor. 4.4). "The devil and his angels" are referred to in Mt. 25.41. In his exegesis of this passage Cremer says: "The angels of the devil are mentioned over against the angels with which the King has come Mt. 25.31 and the devil's former kingdom . . . (over against the kingdom of Christ which has now been revealed) in comprehended as a kingdom which has found its eternal end in consuming fire."¹ The New Testament makes it quite clear, however, that the cosmic conflict between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan does not relieve man of personal responsibility for his own sin.² The demons and unclean spirits are closely connected with Satan (Lk. 10.17 f. 11.15 ff.), so that Jesus could say, "if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Mt. 12.28).³

The Apostle Paul speaks of supramundane powers, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις, κυριότητες, θρόνοι (I Cor. 15.24; Eph. 1.21, 3.10, 6.12; Col. 2.10, 15).

Of evil supramundane powers in Eph. vi. 12, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου... This designation may have been selected without any further defining clause, because the characteristic feature is, that they come forward as powers, and do not, like the angels, serve; they appear not in dependence on the redemptive economy of God, but in attempted independence, i. e., opposition In like manner, Eph. ii. 2, ἐξουσία τοῦ αἵματος will denote the entire powers, not earthly, and yet not heavenly, which have put themselves into closest relation to the earth, whose ἀρχὴν (cf. Eph. vi. 11, 12) is the devil . . .⁴

1 Eschatologische Rede, p. 201. 2 Cremer-Koegel, p. 188 f.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 170. Cf. Cremer-Koegel, p. 188.

4 Ibid., pp. 115, 237.

The Last Things

Throughout the New Testament there is a tension between present and future. The Gospel "represents the blessings of salvation as attainable in this present state, yet describes them as belonging to the future, and as fully unfolded and realized only at the consummation of all things".¹ The Kingdom is spoken of as already present and yet to come.² Eternal life "belongs to the αἰὼν ἑρχόμενος Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30; and as blessedness in the future, it is the object of Christian desire and hope; . . . but at the same time . . . already in the possession of all who are partakers of the N. T. salvation 'that leadeth unto life,' and who in this life begin life eternal".³ The Apostle Paul taught that the believer has already died and been raised with Christ; in Christ he is a new creature. "There is, however, a difference between this state and the outward condition and circumstances of the believer, just as between 'the inward and the outward man,' 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, 16-18, and the solution of this difference is reserved for the future, especially for the second coming of Christ, Col. iii. 3,4."⁴ In the Johannine writings the life which is in Christ is said to be given to the world through His death, and "in the possession of

1 Ibid., p. 535.

2 Ibid., p. 134.

3 Ibid., p. 273. "Auf geschichtlichem Wege ist es zu unser Erloesung gekommen. Die Erloesung ist da; wir koennen sie haben, wie Paulus sagt: 'in Christo haben wir die Erloesung durch sein Blut, die Vergebung der Suenden' (Kol. 1,14). Und doch ist sie auch noch nicht da, denn wir sind 'wiedergeboren zu einer lebendigen Hoffnung', die erfuehlt werden wird durch die Wiederkunft Christi vom Himmel her (1 Petr. 1,3 ff.)." Cremer, Weissagung und Wunder, pp. 82 f.

4 Cremer, ET, p. 273.

those who by faith have come to Him . . . But a reference to the still¹ future consummation of the plan of redemption is everywhere apparent".

The Primitive Church which proclaimed the Cross and the Resurrection lived in the expectation that the Parousia was imminent. "The renewal of prophecy forms an integral part of the history of Jesus," wrote Cremer in the foreword to his Eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi. The Fulfiller of all prophecy closed His earthly sojourn with another prophecy. After His ascension the promise of His return was proclaimed² to the disciples by messengers of God. Jesus had warned His disciples against a "too precipitate expectation of the end". It was first necessary that the gospel be preached to all nations, and then the end³ would come (Mk. 13, 10, Mt. 24.14). The time between Pentecost and Parousia is the time of the world mission of the Church. The reason for the delay in the final consummation of God's plan is explained in II Pet. 3.9. "What seems a delaying of the promise is really not so, but a delaying of the judgment; and that at which the mockers mock in the presence of those who wait for the second coming of the Lord, is⁴ really for them a call of grace to repentance."

1 Ibid., pp. 273 f. 2 Cremer, Eschatologische Rede, iii.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 269. Cf. Weissagung und Wunder, p. 83.

4 Ibid., p. 28.

5 Ibid., p. 394. Cremer's eschatology is open to the criticism that it is too futuristic; he does not always attach enough importance to what Christ has already done. The Apostolic witness refers to the past and the present as well as to the future. Israel's past and the world's future were viewed in the light of the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection;

The Christ who came in great humility as the Son of Man, Israel's rejected Messiah, will yet be revealed to the whole world as the glorified Son of God who has dominion over all things. "Christ represents the word of God as it has come into the world; but since the world does not receive it, its triumphant power must finally be revealed by a decisive conflict and victory." ¹ Cremer's exegesis of Mt. 24.15 ff. led him to believe that the Parousia will not occur until the very antithesis of Christian hope has been made manifest. The Church will be reduced to the uttermost extremity. She herself must go the way of the Cross and experience the contradiction between the Kingdom of God and the world powers. ² The (βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (Mt. 24.15; cf. Dan. 9.27, 11.31, 12.1) must originally have been a reference to the profanation of the temple in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. This desecration was made possible through a coalition between the covenant breakers within Israel and the world power. There

1 Ibid., p. 394. Cremer's eschatology is open to the criticism that it is too futuristic; he does not always attach enough importance to what Christ has already done. The Apostolic witness refers to the past and the present as well as to the future. Israel's past and the world's future were viewed in the light of the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection.

2 "Das εἰς μαρτύριον des V. 14. wird nun in seiner eigenthuemlichen Bedeutung noch besser erkannt, indem es eben um des Gegensatzes willen stent, in welchem Weltreich und das Koenigreich κ. ε. steht, vgl. Matth. 10, 18." Cremer, Eschatologische Rede, p. 62.

"Gefoerdet hat mich auch, dass ich bei Cremer auf die Erwartung des Antichrists stiess, nicht nur der Tradition zulieb und nicht als Anlass zu eschatologischer Traeumerei, sondern als befestigte Ueberzeugung, dass die Christenheit vor ihrer Vollendung dem ihr widerstehenden Gegensatz erliegen werde. Er stand darum in seinem entschlossenen Kampf ohne die Hoffnung auf Erfolg und Sieg. . . . Er fuehrte den Kampf nicht in der Meinung, das ihm dafuer Lorbeeren beschert wuerden, vielmehr in der Ueberzeugung, es sei unmoeiglich, unser Volk vor dem Versinken in die Gottlosigkeit, die durch die Abweisung Jesu entsteht, zu schuetzen." Schlatter, Rueckblick, p. 142.

will be a similar situation in the last times. Opposition to Christ will come not only from without, but also from within, from the godless within the Church of God.¹ The deadly opposition between the kingdoms of this world and the Kingdom of God will reach its climax in the setting up of the Abomination of Desolation in the temple at Jerusalem. Everything godly and Christlike will be replaced by an idolatrous being of the first order. When this has been accomplished the world power will have come to the end of its time. It will not succeed in destroying the Church, for, prior to the end, Christ will come to rescue His elect.²

There is no justification for an allegorical interpretation of the passages which have to do with Christ's second coming. It is not enough to say, as Augustine did, that He comes through His word or Spirit. In His eschatological discourses Jesus places a thoroughly realistic emphasis upon His future return.³ Because the whole creation has become involved in sin, the appearance of Christ in His glory will result in a cosmic catastrophe.⁴

1 Cremer, Eschatologische Rede, pp. 61 f.

2 Ibid., pp. 116, 251f. "Wiederum sieht man ferner, wie Israel bei dieser grundlegenden Weissagung des N. T. zuruecktritt. Jener Sammlung zu Christo (ἐπισυνάγειν) hat sein Objekt an Christus, vgl. Matth. 23,37. 2 Thess. 2,1. Hebr. 10,25. Jac. 2,2.; anders 12,22.) behufs der Bildung eines Volkes Gottes, dem das Reich gegeben werden soll, jener Hinzu-Versammlung, welche Israel verachtet hat, 23,37., werden nun die Auserwählten theilhaft." Ibid., p. 117.

3 Ibid., p. 207.

4 "Die kosmische Bedeutung der in dem Greuel sich gipfelnden Welt-suende, das Verflochtenseyn des ganzen Weltbestandes in die Suende (vgl. Roem. 5,12. 1 Joh. 5,19. Roem. 8,19. bis 22.) bringt es mit sich, dass,

The future of the Jews in relation to God's economy of redemption was a matter of real concern to Cremer. The Messiah came from Israel and for Israel, and yet, paradoxically, He was rejected. "He came unto his own and his own received him not" (Jn. 1.11). Now Israel stands under a curse, without priest, altar, or temple; she cannot live and she cannot die; and all this in order that she may yet¹ return to her Messiah. When the Jews did not accept Him as their king, Jesus spoke to them as a prophet:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.²

wenn der Ueberwinder erscheint, die leblose Natur zittert und alle Geschlechter der Erde heulen . . ." *Ibid.*, p. 252. In the N. T. man is never viewed in isolation from the world. Regeneration involves not only the individual, not only the human race, but also the cosmos. The cataclysmic natural disturbances of the end-time are the birth pangs of the new creation, the new heaven and new earth. Cf. Cremer on Mt. 24.7, *ibid.*, pp. 35 f.

1 Weissagung und Wunder, pp. 1f.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 1. "Zwischen jenem Einzuge 21, 1 ff. und der endlichen Verwirklichung von Israels Hoffnung liegt nunmehr die Zubereitung des Volkes auf diese Erfuellung durch Gerichte, bis dass sie sich dem Verworfenen wieder zuwenden, und ihn, wenn er kommt, ihr Gefaengnis viel spaeter, als beabsichtigt war, zu wenden (Luk. 1,71.), segnend empfangen. Vgl. Sach 12,10. 13, 7-9. Matth. 23,39. coll. 37." *Ibid.*, p. 9. In this interest in Israel's future we may discern another link between Collenbusch and Cremer. Collenbusch wrote in his notes on the Apokalypse: "Der Herr Jesus sagt: das Heil kommt von den Juden. Ganz Israel wird selig werden, die Juden werden wieder in ihr Land ziehen, und alsdann wird das Heil von den Juden kommen, zu allen Voelkern des ganzen Erdboden." Collenbusch's Nachlass, p. 51.

The Rabbis speak of the time of the Messiah in language which is strikingly similar to that of Matthew 24 and 25, but Israel's later Messianic theology only proves how little she understands her own
¹
 sufferings.

1 Cremer, op. cit., p. 248. "Ich kann nicht unterlassen, es auszusprechen, dass nur dann Israel wahrhaft evangelisirt werden wird, wenn es zum Verstaendnis seines Leides gebracht und ihm die ganze volle Wahrheit nicht vorenthalten wird, dass es, wie es thatsaechlich ist, seine Stellung verloren, und statt zuerst zum Schauen der Parusie zu gelangen, erst durch Vermittlung derjenigen Gemeinschaft dazu kommen wird, welche bis dahin den Namen Christi getragen und bewahrt hat, naemlich Jesum, den Gekreuzigten." Ibid., p. 249.

CHAPTER VI

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

Righteousness and Justification in the Woerterbuch

In characteristic Lutheran fashion Cremer has built his theology¹ around the doctrine of justification. The steps by which he has made the transition from lexicography to biblical theology are most clearly discernible in his treatment of this one central concept. His interest in the doctrine of justification was aroused at an early period in his life. Collenbusch and Menken had endeavored to find the biblical basis for this doctrine, and while they did not achieve fully satisfactory results they did at least provide Cremer with a point of departure for his own investigations. During his student days at Tuebingen he became convinced that the concept of justification advanced by his teacher Beck deviated from the teaching of the Reformers. This together with discussions with friends and the needs which arose in connection with his parish ministry led him to make a thorough reappraisal of the biblical evidence. He devoted two years to the study of the words associated with the concept of justification, $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ θεοῦ.

1 "Die koeniglich-richterliche - das letzte mit starke Betonung - heilschaffende Gerechtigkeit Gottes der Grundzug in der biblischen Gottes-erkenntnis und in dem Verstaendnisse der Sendung und des Werkes Christi, - dieser dogmatische Leitgedanke wird neben der Anschauung vom biblischen Sprachgeist Cremers eigentuemlichster Beitrag zur Theologie sein." Martin Kaehler, Wie Hermann Cremer wurde?, BFTh, VIII, 1 (1905), p. 17.

The results of these investigations were incorporated into the Woerterbuch and appeared again later in more fully elaborated form in the Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre.¹

That Hebraic, "heilsgeschichtlich," Christocentric orientation which is so characteristic of biblical language comes to the forefront again in the concept of justification as set forth by Cremer in the Woerterbuch. At the outset he distinguishes between the profane Greek idea of righteousness and the biblical conception. In biblical thought God is always the norm by which righteousness is measured. In Greek thought on the other hand, the standard is set by custom and generally-accepted practice. Righteousness is essentially a social virtue. "Right is the sum of the historically-formed relations of life as they manifest themselves in human society, - a view still current in modern jurisprudence . . . Righteousness perhaps includes a certain religious bearing,² but even this with a preponderatingly social reference." Used in a judicial sense, the verb δικάζω meant to "settle or decree what is right, to recognize as right". This could mean either vindication of the innocent party or punishment of the guilty party.³

The Hebrew דָּן which corresponds to the LXX δικάζω is a

1 Ibid., p. 16. Cf. Ernst Cremer, Hermann Cremer, ein Lebens- und Charakterbild, p. 50.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 185.

3 Ibid., pp. 193 f. "Dem, der im Rechte ist, wird zum Rechte verholfen; dem, der im Unrechte ist, wird das Recht gewiesen u. er zurechtgewiesen, beiden wird Recht durch Urteilsspruch, dem Einen zu Gunsten, dem Andern zu Leide; der Zusammenhang ergibt, welcher Fall vorliegt." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 287.

relative concept (Verhaeltnisbegriff);¹ it denotes "a rectitude whose standard is God".² While the Greeks did not speak of their gods as "righteous," righteousness is a basic attribute of the God of Israel. "In Scripture usage the conception of righteousness is more closely defined by its contrast with sin, - a contrast wanting in the profane sphere where neither the word sin nor the conception of it is defined with any sharpness . . ."³ The Hebrew צדק like the Greek δικαιος is a forensic concept. The Israelites thought of justice in positive terms; the emphasis was upon the vindication of the injured party; punishment of the guilty was simply a necessary corollary. God's righteousness is manifested in His kingly judgment on behalf of His

1 This is one of Cremer's important contributions to modern exegesis. Gottlob Schrenk notes that "it was H. Cremer above all, who explained cedhagah as a term of relationship". See Schrenk's article, "Righteousness," Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, trans. J. R. Coates (London, 1951), p. 29. Cf. Cremer, op. cit., p. 58; "Gerechtigkeit ist ueberall ein Verhaeltnisbegriff . . . er sich auf ein Verhaeltnis zwischen zweien bezieht . . ."

2 Cremer, ET, p. 187. The bibliography supplied by Cremer is very instructive: "Der bibl. Begriff der Gerechtigkeit. . . ist so eigenartig, dass namentl. in neuerer Zeit eine Reihe von Untersuchungen darueber angestellt worden ist. Die aeltere Auffassung, welche in wesentlichen Einzelheiten richtige Fingerzeige giebt, aber im Ganzen nur die einer einheitlichen Begriffsentwicklung entgegenstehenden Schwierigkeiten erkennen laesst, liegt am vollstaendigsten vor in Flacius, clavis scr. s. v. justitia. Einen Hauptpunkt, die 'rettende Gerechtigkeit,' wie er es nennt, hat richtig erfasst Collenbusch (weiland praktischer Arzt in Barmen), Erklaerung bibl. Wahrheiten I, 198 ff.; 256 ff.; II, 208 ff.; III, 18 ff.: aufgenommen von seinem Schueler Menken, Versuch einer Einleitung zum eigenen Unterricht in den Wahrheiten der heil. Schrift, 3. Aufl. (Bremen 1833), Cap. 1/10, S. 68 ff. Eine neue Auffassung, namentlich der Gerechtigkeit Gottes u. ihres Zusammenh. mit der Beschaffung des Heils, versuchte unter dem Einfluss Ritschl's Diestel, die Idee der Gerechtigkeit, vorzuegl. im A.T. bibl.-theol. dargestellt, in den Jahrbb. fuer deutsche Theol., 5, 173 ff., anerkannt von Ritschl, die christl. Lehre von der Versoehnung u. Rechtfertigung II, 103 ff. Zur Kritik derselben vgl. Jedoch Wellhausen, Gesch. Israels 1. Aufl. I, 432." Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 272.

3 Cremer, ET, p. 189; Cremer-Koegel, p. 303.

¹
people.

According to the Old Testament view, man's righteousness does not come from his own moral perfection; "no one among men is righteous, but yet . . . they are righteous who so submit themselves to God as to pray for and to expect divine help . . ." Fear of God and reliance upon His promises is Israel's righteous cause.

This appears strikingly in the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the second part of Isaiah. Job does not deny his sinfulness, Job ix. 2, xiv. 4. Yet he expects God to recognize his righteous cause, xiii. 18, xvi. 20, 21, xvii. 8, 9, which, indeed, He does, xlii. 7. . . . The righteousness of the man who appeals to God's righteousness for help, and hopes therein, is not moral faultlessness, sinlessness, but his relation to God, his fear of God, and his hope in Him . . . Nay, even the forgiveness of sins comes from the righteousness of God; cf. Ps. li. 16, ciii. 11, 12, 17. . . . God leads on the righteous cause to victory, and thus He is faithful to His promises, and blends faithfulness to His promise and covenant with righteousness, Ps. lxxxix., xciv. 14.²

The soteriological element in God's righteousness is most fully expressed in Deutero-Isaiah:

Israel is a sinful people, Isa. xliii. 26, . . . his righteousness is "a spider's web," lix. 5, 6, and a "filthy garment," lxiv. 5. . . . Yet in the face of their oppressors Israel's cause is righteous, and when they have been sufficiently humbled, and have received double for their sins, its righteousness will be revealed. . . . They will be saved from their enemies, i. e. will be justified through the righteousness of God who works right for His people. . . . Thus it is as Flacius says (*Clavis Scr.* s. v. *justitia*), "Educere aut proferre dicitur Deus justitiam nostram, cum causas nostras et nos ipsos ab oppressoribus liberat ac victores facit cumque sic nobis testimonium innocentiae et justitiae coram orbe terrarum tribuit," cf. Jer. li. 10; the righteousness of God is benigna Dei liberatio ab oppressoribus nostris nos vindicans.³

1 Cremer, ET, p. 691; *Woerterbuch*, 6th ed., p. 287. ". . . bz. es [δικαιώω] nie strafen, sond. ein Rechtsurteil zu Gunsten dessen, dem es gilt, die Einsetzung Jemandes in sein Recht, ihm zum Recht verhelfen . . ."

2 Cremer, ET, p. 691.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 692.

The Hebrew concept of righteousness is further developed by Cremer in his article on *צדק* (צדק). The view was prevalent, particularly after the Exile, that the poor and oppressed, widows and orphans, and all who suffer violence unjustly had their sole hope in God and His saving righteousness. (Ps. 10.2, 37.14; Is. 3.14; Ezek. 18.12; Job 29.12). As a rule the God-fearing stand in an unfavourable position over against the world. They are the ones for whom God intervenes, the ones for whom the Messianic salvation is prepared. This Old Testament conception is of great importance in the interpretation of the Beatitudes (Mt. 5.3 ff., Lk. 6.20 ff.). The Old Testament influence is perhaps strongest in the Lukan text.¹

During the Intertestamental period the concept of righteousness began to deteriorate. Although the soteriological import of the Old Testament *צדק* is not wholly lost in the apocryphal literature, Greek elements have been introduced. In Wisdom and IV Maccabees "Greek influence appears in the combination of *δικαιοσύνη* with the other so-called cardinal virtues *ἀνδρεία*, *σωφροσύνη* and *φρόνησις* It may also be attributed to Greek influence that *δικαιοσύνη* in the Book of Tobit appears as a social virtue, and is limited to the exercise of pity, a limitation which, though akin with Deut. xxiv. 12, 13, Prov. xii. 10, is alien to the Scripture view. . ."² Alexandrian Judaism was inclined

1 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 964 f.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 693.

to substitute the Greek idea of righteousness for the Hebrew concept while Palestinian Judaism restricted the meaning of צדק and applied it chiefly to charity or almsgiving. The more characteristic rabbinic word for righteousness was צדקה¹ which conveyed the idea of purity, uprightness and well-earned reward.

The New Testament cuts through these faded and perverted conceptions and reunites with the Old Testament. God manifests Himself supremely as King, Judge, and Saviour. Throughout the entire course of redemptive history the προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι (Mt. 13.17) were those who bore witness to God's saving righteousness and waited for the final deliverance. The Day of Yahweh, the Parousia, would bring redemption to God's servants and judgment to their enemies (Rev. 6.10, 16.5-7; II Thess. 1.6).² The righteousness of God has now been revealed in Jesus Christ (Rom. 3.21 f.). He is described in thoroughly Old Testament language as the Holy and Righteous One (Acts 3.14). He did not appear in order to enunciate moral values, but in order that He might stand before God on behalf of sinners.⁴ The New Testament realization of the Old

1 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 307 f.

2 "Auf das heilschaffende Verhalten Gottes durch seine richterl. Gerechtigkeit geht dann auch das joh. Wort Joh. 17,25 . . . sowie namentl. das die alttest. Anschauung auf den prägnantesten Ausdruck bringende paulin. Wort Rom. 3,26 . . . Ebenso alttest. ist I Joh. 1,9. . . vgl. Ps. 51,16. Jes. 33,24 u. a." Cremer, Woerterbuch, 6th ed. "Als Gott eigene Gerechtigkeit geht δίκ. stets im Anschluss an das A.T. auf die heilschaffende Selbstbethätigung Gottes . . . welcher fuer die Gerechtigkeit der Seinen eintritt, bzw. sie rechtfertigt." Ibid., p. 283.

3 Ibid., p. 283; Cremer-Koegel, pp. 310, 314.

4 "Von Christo gebr. bz. es den Messias in durchaus alttest. Weise

Testament concept of righteousness is given final expression in the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. No man can be righteous before God apart from the righteousness which has come to him in Jesus Christ. Δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ "is the righteousness which God not only demands, but gives to man . . . and which is appropriated by faith; hence δικ. πίστεως, εκ. πίστεως, so that there results a state of the man which may all the more be called δικ. θεοῦ, because it proceeds directly from God Himself, and is δικ. εκ. θεοῦ".¹ Through the mystery of His grace God is τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἁσεβῆ . The paradox becomes even greater in view of the fact that δικαιοῦν has the same meaning here as in Ex. 23.7: οὗ δικαιοῦσι τὸν ἁσεβῆ ἐνεκεν σώρων. The Jews had come to regard forgiveness as something which had to be earned; they had ceased to understand it as the free gift of God's grace. Through Jesus Christ Paul acquired a new understanding of the Law and the Prophets. He adopted the word δικαιοῦν as most suitable to express the new-found relation between Christ and the sinful world.²

sowol als den, . . . der in vollendeter Weise Recht hat, indem er in dem rechten Verhaeltnisse zu Gott steht, der Recht hat u. die Gerechtigkeit Gottes auf seiner Seite hat u. darum Heilsmittler ist. . . Es spricht nicht eine sittl. Wuertigung Christi aus, dass er der vollendet Rechtschaffene sei . . . sondern dass er im Unterschiede von den Suender u. fuer die Suender derjenige sei, der vor Gott bestehe u. Gott fuer sich habe . . ."
Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 279.

1 Cremer, ET, p. 192.

2 Cremer, ET, p. 291. "Die Uebersicht des neutestamentl. Sprachgebr. wird ergeben, wie unmittelbar u. ungetruebt durch Schule u. Tradition der neutestamentl. u. namentl. der paulin. Begriff an das A. T. anknuempt." Ibid., p. 277. "Voraussetzung der paulin. Darstellung ist durchaus der alttestamentl. Begriff der Gerechtigkeit u. insbesondere die messian. Verheissung Jes. 40-46 . . ." Ibid., p. 282. "Somit ist δικαιοῦν von dieser Gnadenbethaetigung Gottes an dem Suender bzw. dem Glaebigen . . .

The group of words connected with the biblical concept of righteousness and justification is related to an even wider circle of biblical terms. Some of the key words which are closely related to δικαιοσύνη are: βασιλεία (ἐπὶ τὸν), κρίμα (ἐν τῷ), ἔλεος (τῷ), ἀλήθεια (ἐν τῷ), σωτηρία (ἐν τῷ), ἐλπίς (ἐν τῷ).¹ The interrelation of the above Hebrew words is strikingly

das von Paulus im unmittelbaren Anschluss an den alttestamentl. Sprachgebr. aufgenommene u. zum term. techn. gepraeagte Wort, welches das Raetsel des A. T. loest u. dem Verhaeltnis Gottes des Richters zur suendigen Welt, wie es sich in der Heilsoffenbarung u. Heilsmitteilung gestaltet, seinen zutreffendsten u. vollkommendsten Ausdr. giebt. Es ist in der That so, wie Paulus sagt: δικ. θεοῦ καρπορευμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν Roem. 3, 21 . . ." Ibid., p. 292.

1 See Cremer-Koegel on δικαιοσύνη and βασιλεία: "D. Gerechtigkeit Gottes ist unaufloesl. verbunden mit d. Gedanken seines Koenigtums, seiner Herrschaft. . . . Gott richtet mit Gerechtigkeit, dies ist d. Hoffnung aller Unterdrueckten, Vergewaltigten, Elenden, u. darum ist Gottes richtende Gerechtigkeit Israels Hoffnung u. Israels Heil." pp. 303, 311. "Indem Gott d. gerechten Sache zu Siege hilft, ist er seinen Verheissungen treu, u. dadurch verbindet sich mit d. Gerechtigkeit d. Verheissungs- und Bundestreue." p. 305. κρίνω is synonymous with σώζειν, λυτροῦν, ῥύεσθαι, δικαιοῦν. "ἐν τῷ" stands mainly with the innocent as its object . . . the main point being the triumph of right on behalf of the people" (Gen. 18.25; Judg. 3.10, 4.4 et al.) Cremer, ET, p. 753. Concerning δικαιοσύνη and σωτηρία Cremer says: "Gerechtigkeit u. Heil bzw. Heilserwartung gehoeren zusammen . . ." Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 281. Cf. Cremer-Koegel on ποιμήν: "In d. messian. Zeit Jhvh selbst als Hirte seines Volkes annehmen u. ihm Recht u. Heil schaffen wird Jes. 40,11, Ez. 34,11f., bzw. seiner Knecht, d. Messias z. Hirten geben will Ez. 34,23; 37,24. So ist dann Ps. 23, 1 Ausdruck d. Zuversicht, dass Gott d. Bedraengten u. Unterdrueckten Recht u. Heil schaffe, u. das hiernach gezeichnete Bild schliesst das ein, was unter βασιλεύς, βασιλεία τ. θ., δικαίω, δικαιοσύνη nach d. soteriolog. Inhalte dieser Begriffe zu Sprache gekommen ist." p. 957. See Cremer on ἀλήθεια and ἐλπίς, ET, pp. 630, 254.

illustrated in the LXX where the Greek equivalents are sometimes used¹
interchangeably:

ΤΩΠ = ἔλεος in most LXX passages, but
ΤΩΠ = δίκαιοςσύνη in Gen. 21.13, Ex. 5.13, Is. 63.6 et al.

ΠΡΤΥ = δίκαιοςσύνη in most LXX passages, but
ΠΡΤΥ = ἔλεος in Is. 56.1, Ezek. 18.19, 21
= ἐλεημοσύνη in Deut. 6.25, Is. 59.16, Ps. 24.5 et al.

ΕΙΩΝ = ἀλήθεια in most LXX passages, but
ΕΙΩΝ = ἐλεημοσύνη in Is. 38.18

ΕΙΩΝ ΔΘΩΡ = κρίμα δίκαιον instead of ἀληθές in Zech. 7.9
Ezek. 18.8.

Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre

Cremer's book on the Pauline doctrine of justification was the outgrowth of his lexicographical studies. The scope of this work is much broader than the title would suggest; it is really a biblical theology built around the concept of justification. The whole thought-world of the Old and New Testaments is viewed in the light of this one concept. Election, atonement, reconciliation, regeneration, and sanctification are all understood in terms of justification. In short, justification and redemption are one and the same. Through justification the sinner receives everything which he lacks; he becomes partaker of all² the fullness of God.

1 Cremer-Koegel, pp. 311, 420, 422; ET, pp. 248, 627, 630.

2 Cf. Ernst Cremer, op. cit., p. 272. Woerterbuch articles cited by Cremer in his Rechtfertigungslehre are: πτωχός, πρᾶξ, τάπεινος, πενθεῖν, δίκαιος, ἀλήθεια, πιστός, πίστις, δικαίηκη, ὀργή, υἱός, βασιλεία, παλιγγενεσία, πνεῦμα, δικάσιον, ἐκλέγεσθαι, ἐνδύω, στοιχεῖον, ἰλάσκομαι, καταλλάσσω.

Out of a total of 448 pages, 159 deal with the Old Testament and 289 with the New. Only 149 pages are devoted specifically to Pauline theology. Cremer has considered the Old Testament concept of righteousness, the post-exilic idea of God's righteous judgment, the preaching of John the Baptist, the preaching of Jesus in the Gospels, the Apostolic preaching in the Book of Acts, and, finally, the Pauline Gospel.

When Paul spoke of "the law and the prophets" he meant the whole Old Testament. Does the Old Testament really support Paul's view that man's faith is reckoned to him for righteousness? Cremer thinks the answer is yes, and he sets out to prove his point through a historical investigation of the context in which the Pauline doctrine is set.¹ The investigation properly begins with the prophets and with the Psalms.² The Psalms are Israel's answer to the Law and the Prophets.

Redemption as God's Act of Justification. - - The righteousness of God and the redemption of Israel are closely-related themes in those portions of the Old Testament most frequently referred to in the New, the Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah.³ Righteousness and salvation are placed side by side in passages like Is. 45.21, "there is no other god besides

1 Hermann Cremer, Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhange ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen (Guetersloh, 1899), pp. 2-6.

2 Ibid., pp. 8, 96.

3 Ibid., p. 11. There are 30 citations from Deutero-Isaiah in the N. T., and 55 from the Psalms, more than the total number from the Pentateuch and the rest of the Major Prophets combined.

me, ¹ וְיִשְׁלַח יְיָ אֶת יָדוֹ לְהַצִּיל, and Is. 56.1, "my salvation is near, it will come, and my righteousness will be revealed". This combination occurs in the other prophets also, but less frequently. In Micah 6.5 God's mighty acts in the redemption of Israel out of Egypt are called ² צְדָקָתוֹ יְיָ. The prophetic proclamation of redemptive righteousness is echoed in the Psalms. God's grace (חֲסֵד) ³ is a manifestation of His righteousness (Ps. 112.4, 116.5).

To the modern Western way of thinking God's righteousness and God's grace are two irreconcilable opposites. How can sinful man place any hope in the judgment of a righteous God? Ritschl sought to avoid this difficulty by maintaining that, in the Old Testament proper, God's righteousness was not associated with penal justice. Righteousness was simply God's own inner consistency expressed in His ultimate aim for the world. ⁴ Penal justice, according to Ritschl, was a late development. There were a few isolated instances of it in the canonical Old Testament, but there were of post-exilic origin (Lam. 1.18, Neh. 9.33, II Chron. 12.5-6, Dan. 9.14). He attributed the idea of divine recompense in the apocryphal books to late Jewish or Hellenistic influence. The notion of a mechanical relation between reward and punishment was essentially ⁵ pagan.

1 Ibid., pp. 11 f. 2 Ibid., p. 13. 3 Ibid., p. 15.

4 Ibid., p. 18. Cremer cites Ritschl, Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, 2nd ed., II, 102 ff.: Diestel, "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit vorzueglich im Alten Testament," Jahrbuecher fuer deutsche Theologie, V (1860), 173 ff.; and H. Schultz, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 5th ed., p. 424.

5 Ibid., pp. 19-20.

Cremer pointed out, however, that Ritschl had succeeded in getting rid of one pagan idea only to introduce another. What he presents is not the Old Testament, Hebraic thought-mode, but a modern version of the ancient Greek idea of righteousness as moral excellence. Righteousness in the Old Testament sense is neither justitia distributiva nor moral virtue; it is a judicial, forensic concept. Ritschl's conception of the teleological, purposeful activity of God is more akin to the biblical idea of divine wisdom, yet nowhere in the Old Testament does God's righteousness appear in close connection with His wisdom.¹

The whole problem can be resolved if one realizes that there is no fundamental contradiction between the righteousness of God and the grace of God. The aim of God's judgment is positive, not negative; His righteousness effects salvation. Ritschl was wrong in saying that punishment was not included in the earlier Old Testament concept of righteousness. Is. 5.15-16 has to do with God's judgment upon Israel. Furthermore those passages cited by Ritschl as examples of the later concept of punitive judgment (e.g. Dan. 9.14) must be taken in their larger context in which the redemptive character of God's judgment is apparent. God's righteousness may either work salvation or the very opposite, depending upon the relation in which one stands to God.²

1 Ibid., pp. 21-22.

2 Ibid., pp. 23, 29-30. "Es verhaelt sich damit nicht anders, als mit der Heiligkeit Gottes, in welcher er, der Heilige Israels, sein קדש ist, und doch wird einmal wider Erwarten gelten Jes. 10.17: 'das Licht Israels wird zum Feuer, und sein Heiliger wird zur Flamme und setzt in Brand und frisst seine Dornen und Disteln auf einen Tag.'" Ibid., p. 32. "Im ganzen Alten Testament ist und bleibt die Gerechtigkeit Gottes justitia salutifera weil sie ihrem Wesen nach justitia justificatoria ist, d. h. weil es ihr Wesen ist, Recht zu schaffen denen, die es beduerfen oder das Recht zu Gunsten des Volkes Gottes auszuueben und ihm dadurch zu helfen." Ibid., p. 33.

The biblical concept of righteousness cannot be derived from an idea, whether it be man's idea of God or of himself. The Hebrew צדק is not abstract; it denotes a thoroughly concrete relation between subject and object, between a subject which makes a claim and an object¹ which fulfils that claim. The relationship between the two constitutes the norm. The object is "right" if it answers to its subject.² The modern concept of justitia distributiva comes from Roman law in which it is not the person but the so-called "thing" that counts, but a very different concept lingers in the folk consciousness of the German people. Primitive tribal justice demands right on behalf of the person.³ When the Old Testament speaks of reward or recompense (Gen. 15.1, Is. 40,10, Jer. 31.16, Prov. 11.21) this is not to be understood in a mechanical sense. Nor is this a lower form of justice as Ritschl maintains.⁴

The Object of God's Redemptive Righteousness. - - If God acted only on behalf of the poor and the downtrodden His righteousness would be

1 Ibid., p. 34.

2 "Vgl. das arab. rumh sadq, eine gerechte Lanze. Eine Lanze kann noch so sehr eine 'richtige' oder gar eine 'gerade' Lanze sein und allen Anforderungen an 'die Idee' einer Lanze genuegen und ist trotzdem noch immer nicht sofort auch eine gerechte Lanze . . ." Ibid., p. 35.

3 Ibid., p. 38.

4 Ibid., p. 40. Cf. Cremer-Koegel, pp. 332 f.: "Wird d. heilschaffende Offenbarung d. Gerechtigkeit Gottes in d. messian. Zeit denen, d. leidend u. glaubend darauf gewartet haben d. Lohn bringen. . . . Demgemaess ist es ganz falsch, wenn Ritschl unter vollstaendiger Verkennung d. alttest. Grundlage dieser Vorstellung behauptet, durch Mc. 10,28-31. Mt. 10,37-39; 5,10 f. werde d. Kombination zwischen Leistung u. Lohn in d. Gebiet d. definitiven Absicht Jesu uebergefuert. . . . Im Altertum d. Lohnprincip im Orient anders gestaltet gewesen ist, als d. westlaendischen modernen sozialen Ordnungen."

more understandable, but all Israel is to have the benefit of His saving judgment. Rebellious and sinful Israel is the beneficiary of God's righteousness. The question is, must the sinner first become righteous before he can lay claim to God's righteousness? The sinner can only submit to God's judgment, seek for forgiveness, and hold fast to the promises. Repentance and faith are Israel's just cause.¹ The culmination point for the Old Testament concept of righteousness is reached in Jer. 23.6. The Messianic king, the Branch of David, will be called "Yahweh is our righteousness". Yahweh Himself has interceded for His people; not only is He the champion of Israel's just cause, He is that cause. God is the objective reality of Israel's righteousness and Israel's faith is the corresponding subjective reality.²

The man who holds fast to God with steadfast fidelity is called **יִשְׁתָּדֵק**. He has that quality or attribute of character which is denoted by the word **יִשְׁתָּדֵק**. Abraham was **יִשְׁתָּדֵק** in that he held firm through trial and temptation. Neh. 9.8: "thou hast found his heart **יִשְׁתָּדֵק** before thee, and made a covenant with him, . . . and hast kept thy word for thou are righteous".³ The righteous man is a sinner and must still pray:

1 Ibid., pp. 43-49. ". . . der Begriff der Gerechtigkeit in der That ein Rechtsbegriff ist, und . . . man kein Recht hat, vom Griechentum her den der 'idealen Gesinnung' hineinzutragen." Ibid., p. 51.

2 Ibid., pp. 59-60.

3 Ibid., pp. 61 ff. " **יִשְׁתָּדֵק** hat, wie Schlatter sagt, immer etwas von der bestandenen Versuchung in sich. . . . so wenig verhaeltnismaessig von Glauben bzw. Nichtglauben im Alten Testament die Rede ist, so selbstverstaendlich dennoch der Glaube das grundlegende Verhalten ist, ohne welches der Gerechte nicht einmal gedacht werden kann. . . . Der Grund, auf dem er steht, ist objektiv die Gottesoffenbarung, Gottes Wort und Gottes That, bzw. die Erkuerung Israels und die damit unaufloeslich

"enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no man living is righteous before thee" (Ps. 143.2).

The Righteousness of God and the Kingdom of God, Election, Fatherhood of God, Divine Sonship. - - Cremer next places the concept of justification in its larger biblico-theological context. God's righteousness cannot be thought of apart from His kingship. The kingship of Yahweh occupies a more central place in the religion of Israel than has been generally recognized; it is not just one concept among many. It is the duty of the king to execute judgment and uphold the right. The divine name Yahweh Zebaoth suggests royal power and authority. Yahweh's kingship is frequently referred to in the prophets and the Psalms. Jer. 10.10: "Yahweh is God in truth; he is the living God and the everlasting King". Ps. 74.12: "Yahweh is my King from of old, working salvation in the midst of the earth". Ps. 97.1-2: "Yahweh has become King . . . righteousness and judgment are the foundation of his throne". God's favour rests upon those whom He has chosen to rule over Israel. It was expected that all the blessings of Yahweh's kingship would be bestowed through the Messianic king who would one day sit upon the throne of David and rule his kingdom "with righteousness and with justice" (Is. 9.7). The Branch from the root of Jesse will uphold

verbundene Verheissung, subjektiv der Glaube. Die fest ergriffene und fest gehaltene Gottesthat der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart oder Zukunft ist objektiv seine gerechte Sache, das Festhalten, der Glaube subjektiv. . . . So ergiebt sich, dass das Wort Gen. 15,6 durchaus der Gesamtanschauung des Alten Testaments entspricht. Derjenige, von welchem יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ ausgesagt wird, ist dadurch יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ und als solcher יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ und gegen ihn erweist sich Gott als יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. " Ibid., pp. 66-67.

the right of the poor and the meek. "Righteousness shall be the girdle¹ of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins" (Is. 11.5).

Yahweh is destined to rule the whole earth. Upon "that Day" which stands at the end of the prophetic field of vision His sovereign majesty² will be revealed.

Israelite kingship rests upon divine election. That is what makes Israel's concept of kingship different from the concepts of other nations. Redemption, past, present, and future, is entirely dependent upon God's free election. Ex. 6.6-7: ". . . I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great acts of judgment, and I will take you for my people . . ." Ex. 19.5-6: ". . . you shall be to me a possession before all peoples, for the whole earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation". Through judgment Israel is delivered from judgment, and this is God's kingly act (Ps. 33.12, Is. 49.7, Ezek. 1.17). The election of Israel is the election of Zion, and the election of Zion and Jerusalem points to the kingship of Yahweh³ (Ps. 132.13 ff., Zech. 1.17). God's election of Israel is also

1 Ibid., pp. 75-76.

2 Ibid., p. 77: "Wird dies erkannt und anerkannt, namentlich dass der Tag Jahvehs unaufloeslich mit dem Gedanken des Koenigtums Gottes verbunden ist (vgl. Matth. 25,31.34), so ergiebt sich, dass wie die Prophetie, so ueberhaupt die Religion Israels und speciell die Hoffnung und das Gebetsleben des Volkes in weit hoeherem Masse mit der Idee des Koenigtums Gottes rechnen, als wir anzunehmen gewohnt sind. Diese Anschauung steht im Mittelpunkt der Religion Israels. Gericht, Rechtfertigung, Gerechtigkeit, Heil, Erloesung, - messianische Zukunft und Koenigtum Gottes sind unzertrennlich verbundene Vorstellungen."

3 Ibid., pp. 76-77. "Das ist die freie . . . Erwaehlung, die Grundlage des Koenigtums und der Vaterschaft Gottes und der Gotteskindschaft Israels. . . . Israel hat nur ein objektives, nicht ein subjektives Recht auf Erloesung, und dieses Recht ist eben seine Erwaehlung. . . . Staerker kann es nicht zum Ausdruck gebracht werden, dass der

expressed in terms of the father-son relationship. Jer. 31.9: ". . . I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born son". The deliverance out of Egypt is pictured as God's fatherly act (Ex. 4.22 f., Hos. 11.1); this makes Israel's unfaithfulness all the more flagrant (Is. 1.2-4, Jer. 3.14 ff., Mal. 1.6) and God's faithfulness all the more wonderful, for He will not abandon Israel whom He has adopted as His child, but will¹ rescue her and redeem her (Is. 43.6, Jer. 31.20).

The Concept of God's Righteousness in the Post-Exilic Period. - -

The history of Israel as the elect nation has a unique character all its own. The law was intended to prepare Israel for her vocation as God's servant, the nation through whom God would effect redemption. Redemption would not depend upon that righteousness which corresponds to the Law, but upon that divine election which demands faith. The Cultic Law was designed to release Israel from the guilt acquired through failure to keep the Moral Law. Forgiveness of sins came, not through moral perfection but through faith, and in this sense faith was a substitute for righteousness (Gen. 15.6). Faith and obedience of the Law necessarily go together. The Exile was as much a judgment upon Israel's unbelief as it was a² judgment upon her disobedience.

God's judgment had its effect, and Israel returned from the Exile a chastened people. The spread of Hellenism offered a new temptation

letzte und einzig uebrig bleibende Grund der goettlichen Heilthat lediglich die Erwaehlung ist, und diese Erwaehlung fordert Glauben; יְהוָה יִשְׁמַח בְּעַמּוּתָא
ist das ihr entsprechende grundlegende Verhalten, Deut. 1,31 ff.; 9,23; Jes. 28,16." Ibid., pp. 80-81.

1 Ibid., p. 79.

2 Ibid., pp. 81-82.

to apostasy, particularly during the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, but where formerly only a minority had remained true, it was now only a minority which fell away. During this period the Scriptures began to play an important part in the religious life of the nation. The Pentateuch and the Prophets came to be regarded as canonical, and the Psalms became Israel's praise and prayer book. The Sabbath Scripture readings and the prayers of the synagogue had a profound effect upon the faith of the people.¹ The literary remains from this period which have been preserved in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and the Talmud are perhaps not a fair indication of the religious temper of the nation as a whole since they stem from select groups within Israel.

In the Apocrypha the Old Testament idea of God's redemptive righteousness was joined with another stream of thought in which God's judgment was viewed primarily as punishment.² The pseudepigraphical literature takes up the tradition of the Old Testament prophets and seeks to carry it further. The Kingdom of God and divine judgment constitute the basic themes of all apocalyptic. Jewish Messianic hopes were severely shaken by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. Two different reactions to this situation are reflected in the Apocalypse of Baruch and IV Ezra. The author of Baruch has revised his dogmatics, but his self-confidence is still intact. In IV Ezra the old Messianic

1 Ibid., pp. 95-97.

2 "Man wagt nicht mehr zu glauben, was paradox ist. Die Gerechtigkeit muss sich erst Genuge thun und ihr muss Genuge geschehen, damit fuer die Barmherzigkeit Raum werde." Ibid., p. 111.

dogma remains: the advent of Messiah and Messianic judgment, Israel's universal rule, then the end of the world, the last judgment, and the new creation. But there is an air of disillusionment; this is only a dogma from which the life has departed. The author of IV Ezra dares not¹ hope for the future; God's judgment has been too overwhelming. In the Psalms of Solomon we encounter the Pharisaic misunderstanding of God's righteousness and of the Law. God's judgment is thought of only as punishment. God even punished the God-fearing in order to test them. The Pharisees were very much in earnest with their religion, but their concept of righteousness had degenerated into a justitia distributiva. For them the Law was an unveiling of God's eternal will and demand. In order to be righteous one had to keep the whole Law, even down to the² smallest injunction.

The "Stillen im Lande". - - The Pharisees, who were the self-styled guardians of Israel's true religion, looked down upon the common³ people who did not keep the Law. The masses of the people, the עם הקטן were like sheep without a shepherd. In the midst of this misled, neglected, yet basically religious people there was a holy remnant, a small group who waited for the redemption of Jerusalem and the consolation of Israel. This is the circle from which John the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus came. Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea should also be reckoned as belonging to this group, although they stood alone among

1 Ibid., pp. 118-20.

2 Ibid., pp. 127 f.; pp. 100 f.

3 "Aber wenn schon die berufenen Pfleger der Religion, die Priesterschaft, und die freiwilligen Vertreter derselben, Pharisaeer und Schriftgelehrte, so weit entfernt waren von dem 'Thun der Wahrheit', -wer sollte es nicht begreiflich finden, dass das 'Volk' . . . nun sehnlich hoffte auf einen Koenig, der sich seiner Not annaehme, wie einst Moses, und es von allem irdischen Druck befreite (Joh. 6,15. 26.31). "Ibid., p. 156.

1

their own associates. Their hope was nourished through the Scripture readings and prayers of the synagogue. This probably accounts for that thorough conversance with the Old Testament which is evident on every hand in the New Testament. The Apostles' interpretation of the Old Testament was based upon their understanding of Christ, however, not upon the exegesis of the synagogue.

2

A few of the ancient synagogue prayers give some indication of what the faith of these "Stillen im Lande" was like. The Shemoneh Esre, or the Prayer of the Eighteen Benedictions, is particularly interesting in this connection. The earliest portions of this prayer, which date back before the time of Christ, are free from all traces of Pharisaism and rabbinic theology. The concepts and modes of thought are those of the prophets and of the Psalms. There is no evidence of speculative reflection over the relation between forgiveness and judgment.³ God is the redeeming King and righteous Judge who forgives and justifies all who trust in Him.

Two notable examples of the faith of the "Stillen im Lande" have

1 Ibid., p. 142. "Zacharias und Elizabeth, alle beide 'gerecht vor Gott, wandelnd in allen Geboten und Ordnungen des Herrn untadelig', Maria und Joseph, Simeon, Hannah, die Hirten zu Bethlehem, dann weiter die Armen, denen das Evangelium gepredigt wird, diejenigen, die Jesus selig preist im Anfang der Bergpredigt, die 'auf das Reich Gottes', 'auf den Trost Israels' warten - das sind ihre Repraesentaten." Ibid., p. 101.

2 Ibid., p. 143.

3 "Es ist wirklich Ausdruck des religioesen Lebens, des Lebens in und aus der Schrift, nicht des schulmaessigen und schulmeisterlichen Reflexion." Ibid., p. 144.

been retained in the New Testament, Zechariah's song of praise (Lk. 1.67 ff.) and the Magnificat (Lk. 1.46 ff.). Cremer believes that these two psalms are based upon an authentic tradition.¹ The Magnificat is thoroughly Old Testament in character; so too is the song of Zechariah, and yet there is a note of exultation here which surpasses even the most joyous Old Testament psalms of thanksgiving and praise. The fulfilment had begun; the long-awaited future was breaking into the present.²

The Messianic hope was shared by all Israel with the exception of the priestly aristocracy, the Sadducees. In this they were all one, the Scribes and Pharisees with their theologizing and their political schemes, the "Stillen im Lande," and the mass of the common people, the $\sigma\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ or the $\gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota$. But when the fulfilment did come it did not correspond to the preconceived notions of any of these groups. The Messiah was totally different from what anyone had expected.³

John the Baptist. - - It was the common Jewish belief that the Messianic Age would be ushered in by a renewal of prophecy. Great significance was attached to the Old Testament sayings concerning the second Elijah and the second David (Mal. 3.23; Jer. 30.9; Ezek. 34.23,

1 "Hat nun Lukas die Ueberlieferung aufgenommen, so weist zunachst diese Ueberlieferung auf den israelitischen Grundstock der messiasglaubigen Gemeinde hin." Ibid., pp. 147 f.

2 Concerning the Magnificat Cremer says: "Es ist eine vollendete Reproduktion des alttestamentlichen Glaubenslebens auf seinen Hoehepunkt an der Schwelle des Neuen Bundes." Ibid., p. 149.

3 Ibid., p. 158.

37.24). Jesus Himself referred to John the Baptist as "Elijah who is to come" (Mt. 11.14).¹ The ministry of John the Baptist cannot be explained psychologically as a phenomenon of his own inner life. One must take Luke's assertion at face value: ". . . the word of God came to John the son of Zecharia in the wilderness".² John's preaching and his baptism were a foreshadowing of Jesus' words and deeds.³ John's message about the impending judgment is united with the preaching of repentance and forgiveness, for the Coming One will both judge and forgive. The hour is decisive. John is the last of the prophets sent by God to prepare the way for the Coming One.⁴ But when the Messiah does appear, the manner of His coming is an enigma. He does not come as the Judge; instead, He identifies Himself with those who need forgiveness and is baptized by John.⁵ Jesus is the Judge, and yet John calls Him "the Lamb of God who

1 Ibid., p. 160. Cf. Cremer-Koegel on Mt. 17.10 f.: Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. "Es sich naeml. um d. Herstellung des vom Volk verlassenen Bundes handelt. Hieraus erklart sich auch d. Erweiterung d. betr. Weissagung Lc. 1, 16 f., sowie d. Verbindung mit Moses, in der Elias auf der Elias auf d. Berge d. Verklaerung erscheint. . ."

2 Ibid., pp. 161 f. "Waere es nicht Gottes Wort, das an ihn ergangen, er koemnte ueberhaupt die Erfuellung der alten Verheissung, die Erfuellung aller Sehnsucht und Hoffnung nicht in Aussicht stellen. . . . Er, der Priestersohn, uebt sein Priesteramt nicht nach der Ordnung des ererbten Berufs, sondern in neuer Weise, und kann das, weil seine Sendung selbst schon die Gnade verbuergt, die er verkundet, und weil der Staerkere, der nach ihm kommt, in Kraft des Geistes wahr halten wird, was er gesagt und gethan." Ibid., p. 175.

3 ". . . der Messias das in Wirklichkeit thun wird, was er, der Taeufer, symbolisiere, naemlich die Suenden wegnehmen. Βαπτίζειν ist Waschen behufs Entsueundigung, von Suenden abwaschen, und ist die thatsaechliche Antwort auf das Bekenntnis der Suenden. Ἐν ὕδατι und ἐν πνεύματι verhalten sich zu einander wie Symbol und Wirklichkeit." Ibid., p. 164.

4 Ibid., p. 174.

5 Ibid., pp. 178 f.

takes away the sin of the world" (Jn. 1.29,36). Here a new factor has been introduced into the picture. How do these two things go together, Messianic king and sacrificial lamb? He bears sin in order to absolve from sin, that is the thought behind this saying. Sacrifice is the means by which sin is taken away, and Jesus Himself is the sacrifice. There is nothing quite comparable to this in the Talmud or Pseudepigrapha. Only in Is. 53 in the picture of the Servant of Yahweh do we find these two things combined. The Servant bears the sins of the people and is vindicated by God. Undoubtedly the Messianic imagery in Rev. 5 is a reminiscence of Is. 53. The saying in John 1.29, 36, however, rather suggests the Passover lamb. In any event such an utterance by the Baptist could¹ hardly have been the product of careful reflection.

The Kingdom of God in the Proclamation of Jesus. - - The Kingdom is the basic theme of Jesus' preaching from beginning to end. Kingship and judgment are blended together as in the Old Testament. The recipients² of Messianic salvation are the poor, the downtrodden, the outcasts. The judicial character of the Kingdom is apparent in Jesus' promise to His disciples: "when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes

1 "Nachdem dies Verstaendnis gewonnen war, verschmelzen mit fast unabweisbarer Notwendigkeit die Zuege des wehrlos duldenden Lammes und des suehnenden Opfers und verbinden sich mit dem Bilde des von Gott gerechtfertigten Retters und Richters, und ebenmaessig ergiebt die Geschichte des Messias das Verstaendnis des Taeuferwortes in diesem Sinne. Der Taeufer selbst aber hat sein Wort nicht von irgendwoher entlehnt oder als Produkt seiner Reflexion ueber alttestamentliche Weissagung oder Typen ausgesprochen. . . . Die Taeufer spricht aus, was er gesehen und Gott ihm gezeigt hat, unbekuemmert um die Ausgleichung seiner Aussagen untereinander." Ibid., p. 182.

2 Ibid., pp. 188 ff.

of Israel" (Mt. 19.28). This is judgment on behalf of the people in the sense of the Hebrew ¹ מִשְׁפָּט. At the Parousia when the Son of Man comes in judgment with Power and great glory, it will be for the benefit of His elect who are in affliction and need (Mt. 25.31 ff.).²

Jesus was indeed the Messiah; His mighty works indicated that, and yet He did not come in judgment as expected. This was in order that He might not destroy the sinful world which refused to believe in Him.³ As the opposition against Him grew, Jesus began to speak in parables. The Kingdom was already at work in the world, but its power remained hidden; it was like the seed, the leaven, the acorn. The present form of the Kingdom is not its ultimate form. The parables of the sower, the tares, the net, the unjust judge, the marriage feast, and the vineyard show that at the final consummation all this will be altered.⁴ One can have the Kingdom now, and yet one must wait for it.⁵

From Jordan to Gethsemane and Golgotha Jesus' whole life was a way of suffering, but He willingly goes this way in order that He may

1 Ibid., p. 195.

2 Ibid., p. 196.

3 "Weil das Gericht fuer ein Volk, das Vergebung bedarf, nur Strafgericht sein kann, erscheint er nicht als Koenig und Richter, und daher kommt es, dass man ihm den Messias nicht ansieht." Ibid., p. 220.

4 "Es ist nicht an dem, dass der Begriff des Reiches Gottes in den Gleichnissen umgesetzt wurde in ein Reich geistiger oder vielmehr geistlicher Gueter, so wenig wie es jemals erscheint als ein Reich sittlicher Zwecke. . . . Das reich Gottes ist und bleibt die gottgewirkte Erfuellung seiner Verheissungen, die Erscheinung des Koenigtums des Gottes Israels, der machtvoll richtend in gerechtigkeit seinem Volk Frieden schafft." Ibid., pp. 205, 203.

5 "Das Reich Gottes ist da, . . . es kommt nicht so, dass es beobachtet werden kann nach der Weise sonstiger Beobachtungen, unverkennbar fuer jeden; . . . ἀλλὰ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν (Luk. 17,20), das heisst nicht inwendig in euch, . . . Vielmehr heisst es: es ist mitten unter euch, in eurem Bereich . . ." Ibid., p. 204.

effect forgiveness. His humiliation and patient endurance are not simply an illustration of His religious views; they are an efficacious work of atonement. "The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man belong together. Only those who perceive the Son of God in the Son of Man and believe in Him can also see the Kingdom and are able to understand its mystery . . ." This is not a mystery in the sense of some hitherto undisclosed knowledge; much more it has to do with the unfathomable mystery of God's love, God's self-inclination to us, God who took flesh and bore our sins.¹

The Fourth Gospel has to do with God's righteous, redemptive judgment no less than the Synoptics. Although the mode of expression is different, the thought is the same.² The Old Testament foundations are discernible in this Gospel also. The Old Testament influence is particularly evident in John's concept of faith.³ The significance of baptism in

1 Ibid., p. 223: ". . . zu dem Menschensohn gehoert εἰς ἡμετέρας μαρτυρίαν nicht um von ihr zu zeugen, sondern sie auszuueben." Ibid., p. 257: "Wenn aber Jesus von Anfang an mit seinem Tode rechnete, und dennoch nicht verzweifelte an seinem Beruf und Werk, so hat dies nicht den Grund, dass er auf eine Fortwirkung seines Auftretens und seines Zeugnisses hoffte, dessen Wahrheit doch schliesslich werde anerkannt werden, - also nicht den Grund des Glaubens an die Kraft des Maertyrerblutes. Vielmehr gehoert sein Sterben zu seinem Beruf, zu Ausrichtung seines Werkes, damit man an ihn glauben koenne . . ."

2 "Das σώζειν τὸν κόσμον, 3,17; 12,47, ist und bleibt eine That des rettenden Gerichts . . . Dass Jesus aufs bestimmteste verneint, zur Ausfuehrung des Strafgerichts gekommen zu sein, ist nur insofern eine Vertiefung des alttestamentlichen Gedankens, als dies die Antwort auf die Bitte ist: 'gehe nicht ins Gericht mit deinem Knecht, denn vor dir ist kein Lebendiger gerecht,' Ps. 143,2 . . ." Ibid., p. 264.

3 "Wie sehr er alttestamentlich geschult ist und in der Sprache und in den Gedankenkreisen des Alten Testaments lebt, ergiebt auch das Wort glauben. Das Substantivum πίστεως findet sich - abgesehen von seinem Vorkommen in der Apokalypse - nur 1 Joh. 5,4, sonst stets das Verbum πιστεύειν hierin also dem Alten Testament gleich . . ." Ibid., p. 266.

this Gospel must also be taken into account. Baptism for the remission of sins is not merely symbolic; in the power of the Holy Spirit it is a real act. Those who are baptized with the Spirit receive power to become¹ the children of God (Jn. 1.12, 12,33). He who receives forgiveness of sins has in very truth been born anew. That is the import of the conversation² between Jesus and Nicodemus (Jn. 3).

The Pre-Pauline Apostolic Proclamation. - - Christ's way of suffering and humiliation was an enigma to His disciples; it was an offence to them. They were frightened and dismayed when He allowed Himself to be betrayed into the hands of His enemies. Where was that majestic power which had stilled the storm, healed the sick and cast out demons? Even after the crucifixion they were convinced that He had been the Messiah, mighty in word and deed, but not mighty enough to overcome

1 Ibid., p. 268.

2 "Auf das Befremden des Nikodemus ueber die Forderung der Wiedergeburt antwortet Jesus V. 5: 'wahrlich, wahrlich, ich sage dir, wenn einer nicht aus Wasser und Geist geboren wird kann er nicht in das Reich Gottes kommen.' . . . Die Verbindung 'Wasser und Geist' aber war dem Nikodemus bekannt . . . Denn dass in dieser Verbindung Wasser das Symbol, Geist die Wirklichkeit des goettlichen Handelns bezeichnen sollte, das stand ihm als einem Schueler des Alten Testaments und Theologen Israels fest. Das Wasser als Symbol kannte er von der juedischen Reinigung her, die Reinigung aber bezweckte die Entfernung aller Verunreinigung durch die Suende, die Entfernung aller Schuld. . . . Aber das war das Befremdende, dass des Herrn Wort nicht eine Vergebung meint, welche ergaenzend hinzutritt zu der erworbenen Gerechtigkeit, sondern . . . dass das ganze Leben durch Vergebung ausgetilgt werden muss, um als ein neugeborner Mensch im Reiche Gottes die Erfuellung aller Heilshoffnung zu erleben. Nirgend galt das Fleisch mehr, als in Israel; von Abraham herzukommen, war des Israeliten Stolz, und nun sollte das nichts sein . . . Die Moeglichkeit einer Kontinuitaet, einer einfachen Ueberfuehrung des bisher gefuehrten Lebens in die neue Ordnung der Dinge konnte nicht staerker verneint werden." Ibid., 270,272.

the sins of Israel. It had been a wonderful epoch through which they had just passed, but now all was at an end, the past was irretrievable, now there could be no redemption. Then the risen Christ appeared to them. They had Him back again, but not in the same way as before, for now nothing could separate them from Him. After His Ascension they were united with Him even more fully, and at Pentecost they received His Spirit which enabled them to become His witnesses.¹ Now the riddle of His life was solved for them, His lowly birth, His baptism, His temptation, His way of suffering which led to the Cross.

Cremer believed that the sermons in the early part of the Book of Acts are from a genuine Petrine tradition, although probably not word for word as the Apostle gave them. These sermons are more than mere recollections of one who was a companion of Jesus and an eyewitness of the resurrection;² they are a confrontation with the living Christ. The first Apostolic preaching was to the Jews, and many who heard believed, but they were only a minority, a group called out of Israel. Thus arose the distinction between the συναγωγή of the Jews and the ἐκκλησία

1 Ibid., pp. 276 ff.: cf. pp. 244 ff. "Als Jesus gestorben war, war es mit allen Hoffnungen der Seinen zu Ende. Sie hatten nur noch Erinnerungen an unersetzlich verlorne Gueter, denn alle 'Lehren' Jesu jedes Wort der Ermutigung, des Trostes, war nun hinfällig, und zwar durch ihre eigene Schuld. Sie waren es ja, die dem Herrn die Treue nicht gehalten hatten, nicht einmal sie hatten zu ihm gestanden. Nun war alles verloren und sie mit. Da erstand der Herr und erschien ihnen und gruesste sie mit seinem Friedensgruss. . . . Ihre begrabene Hoffnung kehrte wieder als lebendige Hoffnung, und sie konnten wieder glauben und nun erst recht glauben. Das ist das wiedergeboren sein zu einer lebendigen Hoffnung. . ." Ibid., pp. 420-21.

2 "Mit seinen Worten aber deckte sich die Wirklichkeit; es war Wahrheit, was er sagte, denn jedes Wort, welches er redete, fand seine Bestätigung durch die Gegenwart Gottes und Jesu im heiligen Geiste, welcher diese Wirklichkeit und wahrheit troestend und strafend allen bezeugte, die es hoerten und hoeren wollten." Ibid., p. 280.

1

of those who professed Jesus as the Messiah.

The Pauline Doctrine of Justification by Faith. - - The death of Jesus had been a mystery for Paul also, but his experience was different from that of the other Apostles. In the beginning he had sided with those who utterly rejected Jesus. Such a man could not be the Messiah. Jesus had scorned all zeal for the Law; He had set His own authority above the authority of the Law; He regarded the Pharisees as transgressors and kept company with tax-gatherers and sinners; He did nothing to break the yoke of political oppression; He took God's prerogative upon Himself and forgave sins; although He was obviously a humble man, He had said in the hearing of the Sanhedrin that He was the Messiah. Such a man had deserved to die. So Saul the Pharisee had thought, but this same Jesus had appeared to Him. He had seen the Risen One, the Son of God, the chosen Messiah, the Son of David after the flesh; and this Risen One was none other than the Crucified One, the Nazarene who had been condemned by Israel and put to death as a malefactor. That was the offence the σκάνδαλον which Saul had refused to accept. But now he was completely shattered. All that he had lived for was worse than an error; it was the greatest of sins. The only thing which could free him from this sin was

2

faith in Jesus.

1 Ibid., p. 286.

2 "Paulus ist sich bewusst, den Herrn und zwar den Auferstandenen, der im Himmel zur Rechten Gottes ist, gesehen zu haben. . . . So weiss Paulus noch bis in seine spaeteste Zeit (Act. 26) von dieser Thatsache. Er hat Jesum gesehen. Freilich ἑσχάτον πάντων ὥσπερ εἰ τῷ ἑκτερώματι ὠφθῆ κίμοι (1 Kor. 15,8), wie einer unzeitigen Geburt ist der Herr ihm erschienen. Denn sonst ist der Auferstandene niemanden ausser den vorher erwaehlten Zeugen erschienen." Ibid., pp. 304-6. "Ja, Christi Tod war ein Werk der Suende. . . Seine Auferstehung aber, seine Rueckkehr in das Leben, in unser Leben, - denn das ist Auferstehung-. . . ist der Beweis, das er nicht umsonst gestorben ist, dass all diese Suende vergeben ist." Ibid., pp. 309-10.

Acknowledgement of Jesus as Messiah is the first moment in faith. This acknowledgement does not mean mere assent to a doctrinal proposition.¹ It must be accompanied by trust in Jesus and union with Him. The relation between the Old Testament and the Pauline concept of faith is one of promise and fulfilment.² Paul received His faith through divine election. Because Christ had laid hold of him, he was able to lay hold of Christ. Faith is not an innate capacity of man; it ever remains God's gift.³

Paul's theology after his conversion bore little resemblance to the rabbinic halachies in which he had been schooled. But it was not essentially a new theology which he brought forward; it was the theology of the Old Testament and of the "Stillen im Lande," only it had become clearer now than ever before. The old hope had been realized.⁴ The Old Testament prophets connected righteousness with salvation and the truth of this relationship had been substantiated in a most wonderful and unexpected way. The only way to righteousness is through Christ; that was the shattering realization which came to Paul.⁵ He could still speak of

1 " . . . das Bekenntnis ist nicht blosse Zustimmung zu einem Lehrsatz, sondern Ausdruck des persoenlichen Verhaeltnisses zu dem, den man bekennt Es ist der Glaube, in dem ein Mensch von Christus bestimmt ist; er haengt an Christus, er hofft auf Christus . . . Man glaubt sich zu Christus hin, und thut dies immer aufs neue, um mit ihm eins, oder wie Luther sagt, 'ein Kuchen' zu werden . . ." Ibid., pp. 317 f.

2 Ibid., pp. 323-24. 3 Ibid., p. 326. 4 Ibid., pp. 329-30.

5 Ibid., p. 343. "Die Gerechtigkeit ist fuer die Apostel weder eine Tugend, die man ausuebt, noch die Faehigkeit zur Tugend, Tugendkraft. Dies ist sie fuer den Griechen . . . Fuer den Apostel Paulus ist sie wie fuer den Herrn Christus und wie fuer das Alte Testament sowohl Inbegriff dessen, . . . der das Urteil Gottes fuer sich hat. . . ." Ibid., p. 347.

"works of faith," for faith is, as Luther said, "a living, powerful,
¹ zealous, active thing". When this is taken into account, the seeming
 difference between Paul's emphasis on faith and the emphasis on works in
² the Epistle of James is minimized.

Justification and election are closely related in Paul's thought,
 another proof that his theology has an Old Testament basis. Faith in
 justification is also faith in election, and there is no faith which is
 not effected through the grace of election.
³ The concept of election is
 bound up with the idea of sonship. Christ placed Himself under the curse
 of the Law in order that those who were under the Law might be set free,
 "so that we might receive adoption as sons" (Gal. 4.5). Those who are
 united with Christ through baptism are "sons of God through faith" (Gal.
⁴ 3.26). The Fatherhood of God and divine sonship go together. Generally
⁵ where Paul speaks of the Fatherhood of God he is thinking of election.
 "Fatherhood of God, filial relation to God, election, justification, grace,
 peace, - these are the interrelated concepts in which the whole of
 Christianity comes into view for the Apostle." These are all in the Old
 Testament, and Paul must have been familiar with them before his conversion.
 The Pharisees had a place for them in their system, but did not incor-
⁶ porate them into their life.

1 Ibid., p. 368.

2 Ibid., pp. 291 ff., 368.

3 Ibid., pp. 370 ff.

4 Ibid., pp. 374 f.

5 "Indem er ihn ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Roem. 15,6; 2 Kor. 1,3; 11,31; Eph. 1,3; Kol. 1,3) nennt, steht ihm diese Selbstbestimmung Gottes, was er ist, ewig in seinem Verhaeltnis zu unserm Herrn Jesus Christus fuer uns zu sein, objektiv vor Augen." Ibid., p. 376.

6 Ibid., p. 377.

Paul did not set aside the Law; he continued to be in earnest about it, for it had been given by God, and everything ordained by God had a place in His redemptive plan.¹ Since Christ "the end of the Law" has come, the Law remains as a valid expression of moral truth, but has definitely ceased to be an ordinance of salvation.² And yet faith is the strongest possible acknowledgement of the Law and its claims, for he who through faith is free from the efficacy of the Law knows himself to be bound by God's grace.³

Paul's "universalism" made him well-fitted for the task of carrying the Gospel to the gentiles. Through the rejection of her Messiah Israel had lost her pre-eminence over the other nations. Indeed, Israel's advantage had been great. God had made a covenant with no other nation but Israel; no other nation knew God as Israel knew Him; God had chosen Israel, and from her the Saviour of the world was destined to come (Rom. 3.1-2, 9.3-5).⁴ Paul was himself an Israelite, and the whole New Testament Church rested upon Israelite foundations. Israel's disobedience had been the world's gain. Nevertheless, God had not rejected His people,⁵ and Paul declared that one day all Israel would be saved (Rom. 11.25 ff.)⁵ Wherever Paul went he preached first to the Jews. Only when they rejected him did he turn to the gentile adherents of the synagogue.⁶

1 Ibid., p. 383.

2 "In Christo, dem Haupte der Gemeinde, . . . wohnt die Fuelle der Gottheit nicht mehr wie in den Institutionen des Alten Bundes schattenhaft, sondern wirklich (Kol. 2,9), und was die Institutionen des Alten Bundes nur schattenhaft, nicht wirklich leisteten von der Beschneidung an, das ist in Wirklichkeit an uns geschehen in unserer Verbindung mit Christus und durch dieselbe. . . . wir in der Taufe mit ihm begraben, mit ihm auferweckt und lebendig gemacht sind, Kol. 2,8 ff." Ibid., pp. 387-88.

3 Ibid., pp. 390-91.

4 Ibid., pp. 312, 396.

5 Ibid., p. 372.

6 Ibid., pp. 394.

According to Paul, the justification of the sinner, the communication of forgiving grace takes place through the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 6.11). "The Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ, and the indwelling of the Spirit in us is also the indwelling of God in us."¹ Hence, Paul's threefold formula: "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (II Cor. 13.13).² God effects faith through Word and Spirit together:³

By the Word we believe, in the Word we have the Holy Spirit, in the Word we have God's gracious presence; God, Christ, the Holy Spirit have communion with us in the Word, in the Word He works upon us. Through the Word He rules us, comforts us, impels us. That is to live by the Spirit and to walk by the Spirit.⁴

The Spirit which bears witness in our hearts is not our own spirit, not a "new I". It remains God's Spirit independent of our spirit.⁵ The faith which is our righteousness is also our sanctification. There is no renewal of our inner life apart from faith. Rather, "renewal" is the task of the Christian who is not to be conformed to this world, but should be transformed through the renewal of his mind in order to prove what the will of God is (Rom. 12.2).⁶

1 Ibid., pp. 410, 414.

2 "In dieser Gemeinschaft bewirkt der heilige Geist unseren Glauben, erweckt und staerkt unsere Entschluesse, fordert und foerdert unseren Widerstand gegen alle Versuchungen und Anfechtungen, unser Treue im Gebet, unsern Eifer im Lieben, unser Geduld im Hoffen . . . Ibid., p. 416.

3 "Er wirkt aber - und dies ist nun das endlich entscheidende - den Glauben durch seine Gegenwart, oder durch seinen Geist im Worte, d. i. in dem Wort der Heilsbezeugung. Wer dem Wort glaubt, der hat den, von dem es zeugt, den Gott unseres Heiles, den in Gnaden gegenwaertigen Gott." Ibid., p. 416.

4 Ibid., p. 417.

5 Ibid., p. 415.

6 Ibid., p. 417. ". . . im kirchlichen Sprachgebrauch namentlich seit der Zeit Speners der Begriff der Wiedergeburt, vermeintlich gestueset auf

Evaluation

With this resume of Cremer's Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre before us, it is necessary to ask whether the concept of justification actually occupies the central position which Cremer has assigned to it, 1 Is the whole of Scripture really concerned with the idea of justification? Cremer has defined justification so broadly that he has made it almost synonymous with redemption. He found that he could not study the idea of justification in isolation, but that he must consider its relation to a number of other concepts including election, the Kingdom of God, atonement, reconciliation, and sanctification. He even came to the conclusion that justification is grounded upon election, and thus he is led away from strict Lutheranism toward a more Reformed point of view. This would indicate that it does not essentially matter which concept one chooses to employ as the organizing principle for his biblical theology, for if he allows his thinking to be determined by Scripture, he will inevitably be led to consider other concepts. And all these concepts will fuse together

das anderweitige Vorkommen derselben im Neuen Testament, den Sinn einer religios-sittlichen Erneuerung . . . unseres ganzen inneren Wesens hat . . . Es fragt sich, ob wirklich in gewissen Schriften des Neuen Testaments eine solche Anschauung vorliegt." Ibid., p. 419.

1 In a critical review of Cremer's Rechtfertigungslehre E. Schuerer wrote: "Ich kann nicht verhehlen, dass hier manche Ausfuehrungen mehr den Eindruck einer Predigt, als den einer historischen Untersuchung machen". Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXIV, 25 (9. Dec. 1899), p. 682. The question which must be seriously asked concerning this book and Cremer's work in general is whether he has made sufficient use of the available historico-critical results. He has arrived at a theological interpretation of Scripture, but one sometimes has the feeling that he does so at the expense of the historico-critical method. The problem is still left unsolved. What is the place of the historico-critical method in a theological interpretation?

and point in the same direction. The Pauline doctrine of justification reaches its culmination in I Cor. 1.30: ". . . Christ Jesus . . . our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption".¹

While Cremer remained loyal to his own confession, he made an earnest attempt to let Scripture determine and correct the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. Usually the procedure is quite the reverse. Cremer was not overly dependent upon Luther, but went back directly to Scripture. In other words, he was a biblical theologian first and a Lutheran second.² The insight which Cremer gained through his study of the biblical concept of justification enabled him to free himself from the Pietist misconception of sanctification. At this point the contrast between Cremer and the Erlangen School is most apparent. The central concept in the Erlangen theology was sanctification, not justification. The Erlangen School presented the concept of regeneration in the manner in which it had been presented by Pietism generally since the time of the Great Awakening. But Cremer, who was the product of Pietism, returned to the principle of sola fides and he did so because of what he had learned through his semantic investigations of the biblical usage of δίκαιος, δίκαιοσύνη and ἄγιος, ἁγιασμός.³

1 This passage is cited by Cremer in his article on ἁγιασμός Woerterbuch, 6th ed., p. 59; and in the Rechtfertigungslehre, p. 439.

2 E. Cremer, op. cit., pp. 312-16. Cf. Adolf Schlatter's Rueckblick, p. 138: ". . . Cremer war zuerst Christ, deshalb und hernach Kirchermann, zuerst mit dem Christus verbunden und darum ein Glied der ihm vereinten Gemeinde. Auf diesem Grunde reichten sich der Sohn des westfaelischen Pietisten und der Sohn des schweizerischen Baptisten ohne jede Anstrengung die Hand."

3 E. Cremer, op. cit., p. 317. Cf. W. Luetgert, "Nachruf," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblaetter, p. 86.

Through these studies Cremer discovered that the older Lutheran orthodoxy had also failed to pay sufficient attention to the witness of Scripture. The dogmatists of classical Protestantism derived God's righteousness from the moral order of the world, from the providence which God exercised in the sustenance and preservation of the creation. Cremer pointed out, however, that the righteousness of God is more properly¹ manifested in His covenant with Israel and in the promise of salvation. The Church theologians had also neglected an important feature of the biblical concept of holiness. God's holiness is made manifest in reconciliation and redemption as well as in judgment.² God's righteousness and holiness include the element of grace. This emphasis is a distinctive feature of Cremer's theology, and it is all the more valuable in that it was not his own idea but the result of his conceptual-historical studies. Ernst Cremer believed that his father's articles on δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη and ἅγιος, ἁγιασμός were the most significant studies in the Woerterbuch because they reveal the theologian who tries by means of Scripture to come nearer to the solution of dogmatic problems.³

There is an incidental but important point to be raised in connection with Cremer's discussion of the "Stillen im Lande", (Rechtfertigungslehre, pp. 141 ff.). Cremer wished to locate that particular group within Judaism which was most closely associated with the origins

1. E. Cremer, op. cit., pp. 160 f.

2 Ibid., p. 161.

3 Ibid., p. 162.

of Christianity, and his efforts in this direction have a certain affinity with the research currently being carried out as a result of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Habakkuk Commentary and the Zadokite Manual of Discipline, in particular, may throw some light on the problem which interested Cremer. Is it an accident that the Zadokite Manual of Discipline emphasizes piety and righteousness, and that the Habakkuk Commentary contains the famous passage (Hab. 2.4) cited by Paul¹ in Gal. 3.11? There are frequent allusions to righteousness in the closing psalm of the Manual of Discipline. Note the following excerpts:

And to God I will say, "My righteousness . . .
the righteous acts of God shall my tongue
recount always . . .
and in his righteousness my transgression
shall be wiped out
my vindication in the righteousness of God
will stand to eternity."²

Cremer's ideas concerning the "Stillen im Lande" need to be supplemented by a more thorough investigation of the Hasidim of the Hellenistic period. These were the small nucleus of the people who remained true to the Law and who appear to have been the spiritual ancestors of the Pharisees.³ Cremer's study of the biblical "Stillen im Lande" may have

¹ According to Millar Burrows, the Manual of Discipline makes much use of the words מִצְדִּיק and צְדִיק, both of which correspond more or less to δικαιόμενος. "In a striking adumbration of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, the concluding psalm of DSD says: 'In his righteousness he will purify me.'" Millar Burrows, "The Discipline Manual of the Judaean Covenanters," *O. T. Studien*, VIII (1950), p. 167.

² Translation by Millar Burrows in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1955), pp. 385 ff.

³ See Hauck in *TWNT*, V, 490: In der Makkabaerzeit erscheinen sie als eine organisierte Gruppe (1 Makk 2,42: συναγωγή Ἀσιδαίων vgl Ps 149, 1: צְדִיקִים לְלִבָּתָם) die um ihres Glaubens willen aus ihrer stillen Friedfertigkeit heraustreten u den Freiheitskampf eintreten. . . . Cf. Millar Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

been motivated by recollections of the Pietist groups of his own boyhood. The followers of Tersteegen were called "Stillen im Lande". Cremer believed that he could see a parallel between the contemporary situation in the German church and the religious situation in Judaism prior to the advent of Christ. He endeavored to make Greifswald a stronghold against the rising tide of liberalism and secularism, a place where Christianity could "winter over", as it were.

THE APPROPRIATION OF GREGOR'S THEOLOGICAL METHOD TO THE DOCTRINE

Doctrinal Principles and Method

Gregor's dogmatics and his biblical theology are inseparable. His formulation of the biblical doctrine of the atonement, for example, could be classified either as biblical theology, or as dogmatics, as Professor Deibel observed, the strength of Gregor's theology lies in its biblicalness, in the fact that it is so closely connected with the theology of the New Testament. Therefore it cannot be satisfactorily explained on the basis of patristical or medieval or modern theology.

PART III

APPROPRIATION

The approach for dogmatical appropriation, which was called by Gregor's friend and colleague at Wolfenbützel, Otto Stauder, requires a mention in dogmatics and there is an article by Gregor entitled

"Bibliodogmatik". Gregor defines dogmatics as that branch of theology which seeks to give scientific interpretation to the Christian revelation of God and to the awareness of His will in the world which are contained by this God-revelation, but also to offer that interpretation.

Christian dogmatics of God is, says Gregor, based on the revelation

1. G. Deibel, "Theologische Dogmatik", Frankfurt, 1954, p. 10.

CHAPTER VII

THE APPROPRIATION OF CREMER'S LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES IN HIS DOGMATICS

Dogmatic Principles and Method

Cremer's dogmatics and his biblical theology are inseparable. His formulation of the biblical doctrine of the atonement, for example, could be classified either as biblical theology, or as dogmatics. As Professor Oettli observed, the strength of Cremer's theology lies in its biblicism, in the fact that it so nearly coincides with the theology of the New Testament. Therefore it cannot be satisfactorily analyzed¹ on the basis of philosophical trends past or present. His whole theology rests upon biblical rather than philosophical premises. Together with this insistence that dogmatics should have biblical content there is a recurrent Christological emphasis.

The Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, which was edited by Cremer's friend and colleague at Greifswald, Otto Zoeckler, contains a section on dogmatics; and there is an article by Cremer entitled, "Prinzipienlehre". Cremer defines dogmatics as that branch of theology which seeks to give scientific formulation to the Christian consciousness of God and to the awareness of self and the world which are determined by this God-consciousness. But then he adds that the content of the Christian consciousness of God is Jesus Christ; Christ is the Bearer and

1 S. Oettli, "Nachruf," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblätter, pp. 67 f.

Mediator of God's self-revelation for the salvation of the sinful human
¹ race. This, in effect, is a Christological restatement of Schleier-
 macher's definition of theology in terms of religious experience.

In accordance with his principle that theological language should
 be compared afresh with the language of Scripture, Cremer has introduced
 some semantic investigations into his "Prinzipienlehre". We saw earlier
 how he had made a careful conceptual-historical investigation of the word
² λόγος. When he compared the usage of the Greek Fathers with that of
 the New Testament he found that the Fathers had given the word a different
 meaning, a technical meaning developed by pagan philosophers. Thus, in
 the Patristic period, Christian doctrine came to be equated with the
 self-evident, universally-valid truths of philosophy; and theology began
 to follow a Greek tradition which was alien to the thought-world of the
 Old and New Testaments. With the aid of linguistic science Cremer strove
 to free dogmatics from this error. He declared that the authority of a
 theological dogma does not lie in the proposition itself, but in the thing
 to which it refers. God's historical self-revelation in Christ is the
 Dogma of Christianity and the source of all Christian knowledge. ³ Δόγμα
 is simply ³ δίδασκαλον, κήρυγμα as seen from a different standpoint.

1 Cremer, article "Prinzipienlehre," Handbuch der theologischen Wissen-
 schaften, Otto Zöckler, ed. (Noerdlingen, 1884), II, 607 f.

2 Ibid., p. 608. Other lexicographical studies embodied in the
 "Prinzipienlehre" are: πίστις (p. 640) and δίκαιος (p. 50).

3 Ibid., pp. 609 f. Cf. Karl Barth, The Doctrine of the Word of God,
 trans. G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh, 1936), pp. 15 f., 304-315; and Otto Weber,
Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics, trans. Arthur C. Cochrane (London, 1953), p.21.

Christianity is not a philosophy. Although Christian thought must conform to the laws of human knowledge, it is wrong to subject theology to the canons of philosophy as Ritschl and his school have done.¹

Cremer lists three criteria by which dogmatic propositions should be tested: (1) they must conform to the laws by which all scientific proofs are judged; (2) they must agree with Scripture; (3) they must be psychologically in harmony with the analogia fidei.² Proof texts are not a satisfactory means of demonstrating that a doctrine is "biblical". A more thorough, more comprehensive exegetical foundation is required, and this is the task of biblical theology. Cremer held that, because of a faulty method, none of the works on New Testament theology then extant were wholly satisfactory. The theological concepts of the New Testament will not be correctly understood unless they are seen in relation to their Old Testament background. Schleiermacher, who discounted the theological value of the Old Testament, was particularly to blame in this respect. Hengstenberg, Hofmann, and Beck performed a great service for theology by returning to the position held by the Reformers, who maintained that there was an organic unity between the two testaments.³

The basic tenets of Cremer's dogmatic method are seen to correspond with the Hebraic, Christocentric emphases which are the distinguishing features of his hermeneutics.

1 Ibid., p. 613.

2 Ibid., p. 613: "So hat der dogmatische Beweis ein dreifaches zu leisten . . . er ist dialektisch, historisch oder biblisch-theologisch und religioes-psychologisch zu fuhren, ohne dass darum jede dieser drei Seiten gesondert zu verfolgen waere."

3 Ibid., pp. 614 f.

The Attributes of God

Cremer's treatise Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes represents an attempt to restate a traditional doctrine of the Church in Christological terms and to replace scholastic thought-forms with biblical thought-forms. He has brought to this task a wealth of biblico-theological material from the Woerterbuch and from the Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre.¹ He observes at the outset that no portion of Christian doctrine has been more sterile, more loosely connected with the rest of the system of doctrine, more neglected in Church proclamation, that the propositions concerning the divine attributes. Our language about the attributes must originate from God's own revelation of Himself, from the relationship which He Himself has established with us.²

Early in the history of the Church the Apologists equated the God of revelation with the Absolute of philosophy. This amalgamation of Christian thought and Greek thought has had far-reaching consequences in the development of Western culture. For centuries the distinction between faith in God's self-revelation and the scholastic formulation of the idea of God was not sharply enough felt.³ But Cremer will not follow

1 In this monograph Cremer refers to the following articles from the Woerterbuch: ἅγιος (p. 36); δίκαιος, ἰλασκεσθαι, πίστις (p. 50); βασιλεὺς, βασιλεῖν, κρίνειν, ποιμὴν, πρᾶϋς, πτωχός, ῥυεῖν, σῶζειν (p. 56); ἐκλέγεσθαι (p. 60); μισθός (p. 62); πνεῦμα, ἀποκαλύπτειν, πίστις, πιστεύω (p. 88).

2 "Denn wir kennen Gott nur durch sein Handeln fuer uns und an uns; unsrer Glaube wird nur durch sein Objekt, also nur durch Gott selbst in seinem Verhalten zu uns bewirkt." Cremer, Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes, BFTh, I, 4 (1897), p. 9.

3 Ibid., pp. 11, 15.

in the old path. It is meaningless to speculate as to whether God exists, or whether attributes can be ascribed to Him, or whether these attributes can be reconciled with one another. In His revelation God¹ acts, and through His action we learn who He is and what He is like. He reveals Himself to us as love, not through any necessity, but solely in His sovereign freedom. He wills to belong to us, to give His whole self to us, and in that act we are redeemed. In His revelation of Himself² God discloses His whole nature; all that He is, He is for us. He manifests Himself in opposition to the sin and the evil which are per-³verting and destroying us.

We are bound to God's revelation and have to derive the attributes from it. These attributes cannot be derived according to a logical scheme. The freedom of God's love stands over and above every law, be it the moral law, or the law of nature, or the law of logic. While God affirms and maintains all law, He is not Himself bound by it. God's love⁴ for us is the very opposite of all logical possibility. God in His love does not overlook the fact of our sin; indeed, it is through His love⁵ that His judgment of us is made manifest. Under no circumstances may

1 Ibid., p. 16 f. "Wir muessen deshalb unsere Aussage ueber das Wesen Gottes enger und unmittelbarer an seine Offenbarung in Christo anschliessen." Ibid., p. 18. Cf. Otto Weber, op. cit., p. 85; "Barth rightly calls attention to the merits of a little book by Hermann Cremer (Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes, 1897), which appeared half a century ago. In spite of everything it injected some life into the wasteland of an earlier period. Since Cremer, and going beyond him, the first dogmatic theologian to give special attention to this area is Barth." Cf. Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, II/1, pp. 317, 336, 383, 418.

2 Ibid., pp. 18 ff.

3 Ibid., p. 21.

4 Ibid., p. 26.

5 Ibid., pp. 28 f.

the appearance of Christ be regarded as the culmination of a natural human development. The religion of revelation is perverted by the introduction of the developmental hypothesis into theology. The "development" which is taking place in history is not moving toward the higher; it is a movement toward degeneration and destruction. God in Christ performs an act of redemption which is totally opposed to this

¹
"development". Faith in this objective event comes, not through speculation, but through revelation. As the predicate is dependent upon the subject, so the concept of God is dependent upon God Himself, upon the One who reveals Himself as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
²

Cremer divides the divine attributes into two groups: (1) those which are disclosed in God's revelation and (2) those which are included in the concept of God in the light of revelation. The attributes which are directly manifest in God's self-revelation are His holiness, His righteousness, and His wisdom. Much of what Cremer says concerning these three attributes is simply an appropriation and application of the biblical concepts of holiness, righteousness, and wisdom as they are set forth in the Woerterbuch.

All the attributes, according to Cremer, are attributes of God's love as revealed in Jesus Christ.
³ This love stands in opposition to our sinfulness, yet is directed toward us. In Christ we encounter God's judgment and grace at the same time. This powerful opposition to our

1 Ibid., p. 30.

2 Ibid., pp. 31 f.

3 Ibid., pp. 26, 34.

sin, this fusion of judgment and grace is the holiness of God.¹ God's holiness is the ground of His election of Israel and the formative principle of the covenant. Through His free act of election God established a relationship with Israel in spite of her sin and her continuing need for forgiveness.² God's relation to Israel was manifest in her history, in her institutions, in the men of God who were sent to her, and, finally in Jesus Christ.³ Israel's knowledge of the holiness of God is to be understood in terms of redemptive history rather than in terms of a gradual growth in religious perception.⁴

God's holiness is closely connected with His righteousness; for where God reveals Himself as the Holy One, He also reveals Himself as the Judge.⁵ Cremer points out that both Rabbinic Judaism and the medieval Roman Church had a one-sided concept of God's righteousness; both had lost sight of the relation between judgment and grace.⁶ It was thought

1 Ibid., p. 36. On pp. 38-41 Cremer gives a recapitulation of his Woerterbuch article on

2 Ibid., p. 41.

3 Ibid., p. 45.

4 "Die Offenbarung ist Bethätigung der Heiligkeit Gottes nach dem einzigen Princip: wo die Sünde mächtig geworden ist, da ist doch die Gnade viel mächtiger geworden . . ." Ibid., p. 42. "Denn nie hat sich Jemand zum Kinde Gottes 'entwickelt'." Ibid., p. 44.

5 Ibid., pp. 46 f. Almost all the material in the section on the righteousness of God (pp. 46-67) has been taken directly from Cremer's Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre and from the Woerterbuch (δικαιοσύνη, βασιλεία et al.).

6 Ibid., pp. 51 ff.

that God's judgment could only be punitive, not redemptive. Therefore, it was more to be feared than hoped for. God's righteousness is not merely penal justice, nor is it simply the sum of all virtues in the Greek sense. The whole of Scripture speaks of a righteousness which is¹ both judicial and redemptive! Cremer has worked out the concept of God's righteousness in terms of His relation to Israel, the elect nation.

Israel's redemption, past, present, and future is conceived as an act of God's righteousness. God's kingship, His justifying, redemptive action, rests upon His free election; and this leads us back to His holiness. Thus, God's holiness and righteousness are interrelated.² Holiness is to righteousness as election is to justification.

God's wisdom is the third attribute to be derived from His self-revelation. This wisdom, which is linked with holiness and righteousness, is the supremacy of God's redemptive decree over the law of logical consequence.³ This view of wisdom is basically opposed to such Greek philosophical ideas as Plato's ideology, the Logos of the Stoics, and the

1 Ibid., p. 55. Cremer has been frequently criticized for trying to make the biblical evidence come to bear too sharply on this one particular focal point. This criticism was voiced by Reischle in a review of Cremer's "Eigenschaften": ". . . man darf m. E. den Versuch nicht unterlassen, im A. T. zwischen den verschiedenen Schriftgruppen u. Zeitperioden schaeffer zu unterscheiden. . . . Scheint mir bei Cremer der freie Blick fuer die Mannigfaltigkeit biblischer Anschauungen u. fuer die Allmaehligkeit ihres Werdens nicht selten das gewaltiges Pathos getruet zu sein, mit dem er gewisse fuer ihn centrale Gedanken der christlichen Glaubenswelt ergreift." Max Reischle in Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXIV, 15 (22 July 1899), 443 ff.

2 Cremer, op. cit., pp. 58, 66.

3 Ibid., p. 67.

divine world-reason. Redemption is the sphere in which God's wisdom is made manifest. Through redemption it first becomes clear that God's wisdom was the force operative in the creation and preservation of the world.¹ One does not find the wisdom of God by observing the order of nature or by finding "reason in history"; rather, His wisdom is manifest in the peculiar ways which He chooses for the fulfilment of His purpose in the redemption of mankind. The ways of God lead from the election of Israel to the world mission of the Church,² which is really the extension of divine election to include all nations. All events of history, from earliest times until now,³ converge upon a final point of culmination where redemption is actualized.³

Those attributes which are included in the concept of God in the light of revelation are His omnipotence, His omnipresence, His omniscience, His eternity, and His immutability. God's relation to the world is determined only by His own freedom, not by some unalterable law. God is Lord of His attributes; they are not Lord over Him. He reveals Himself in perfect freedom as the living God, the Holy One of Israel, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.⁴

God's omnipotence is seen in His act of redemption in Christ. He enters the sinful world to work against the closed sequence of events in nature and history, and there is no mightier act than this.⁵ God's power and God's Spirit are synonymous. The Gospel is the power of God (Rom. 1.16, I Cor. 1.18), and our faith is effected by the same power

1 Ibid., p. 69.

2 Ibid., pp. 70 f.

3 Ibid., p. 73.

4 Ibid., pp. 74 ff.

5 Ibid., p. 77.

which raised Christ from the dead (Eph. 1.19 ff., I Pet. 1.5, I Tim. 6.15 et al.). Where the proclamation concerning the Messianic King is heard and believed, there the Kingdom is present with power.¹ When God performs miracles, i. e., reaches into the closed sequence of creaturely existence, He does so in order to carry out His redemptive will. God's will to redeem the world does not abrogate His creative will as it is manifest in the continuity of nature. Only at the Last Day will He do away with this continuity, on the Day when He makes all things new (Rev. 21.5), when He creates the new heavens and the new earth (Is. 64.17).²

Knowledge of God's omnipresence is not to be gained from philosophical reflection over the distinction between limited and unlimited existence; rather, this knowledge originates through God's own initiative, through an immanent act of love on the part of the transcendent God. Christian knowledge of God's omnipresence comes through the experience of Christ's own presence by His Word and Spirit. "The Christian knows himself to be sought and found by God and 'incorporated' into His Church through the Word which calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies in the power of the Holy Spirit . . ."³ Wherever God manifests Himself in electing love He establishes a special union between man and Himself. The experience of His saving presence in word and sacrament is the work of the Holy Spirit.⁴ God's communion of love with the Church does not do

1 Ibid., pp. 79 f.

2 Ibid., p. 81.

3 Ibid., p. 85.

4 Ibid., p. 88. "So ergibt sich eine besondere Gegenwart Gottes in Christo, und weil diese Gegenwart eine Gegenwart Gottes in seinem heiligen Geiste ist, so ergibt sich die Heilsgewenwart als Gegenwart des dreieinigen Gottes." Ibid., p. 92.

away with the distinction between Himself and the Church; the Church is not deified, not even at the final consummation of salvation.¹

Of all the attributes, the divine omniscience is the most universally-known and accepted, yet the Christian faith has something special to say about it.² This attribute, like all the other attributes, is an article of faith. God's omniscience should be understood in terms of the fore-knowledge which He exercises in His plan of redemption.³ In God's eternity we have something more than the pagan idea, something more than the Greek distinction between mortal men and the immortal gods. Through the One whom He sends to carry out His eternal decree God saves our life from destruction; He has united Himself with us so that we share His indestructible life.⁴ God manifests His immutability in that He will not alter His will concerning us in spite of our opposition to Him (Mal. 3.6; Nu. 23.19; Ps. 102.28). He remains constant in His love. All that He is, He wishes to be for us and in union with us.⁵ Cremer asserts that "it is the task of Christology to show how the immutability of God, and therewith all His attributes, come to manifestation in Christ, and indeed to a manifestation which is just as wonderful as the fact that God maintains His loving will in spite of our sin."⁶

The whole nature of God is present in each attribute; it is not possible to think of one attribute without the others. God's attributes

1 Ibid., p. 91.

2 Ibid., p. 96.

3 Ibid., pp. 100 f.

4 Ibid., pp. 102 f.

5 Ibid., pp. 106 f.

6 Ibid., p. 107.

are characterized by a unity of judgment and grace, and this unity is His¹ glory. To sum up, knowledge of the divine attributes is mediated through redemptive history rather than through a process of deductive logic.

Instead of starting with a priori principles, we should come in faith to the reality of His self-revelation.

The Authority and Inspiration of Scripture

Cremer closed each edition of the Woerterbuch with these words in large Greek capitals: ΟΥ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΑΥΘΗΝΑΙ Η ΓΡΑΦΗ, "Scripture cannot² be broken" (John 10.35). Kaehler says that this was no mere dogmatic catchword; it was a firm conviction which came to Cremer as a result of his own examination of the written Word of God.³ Scripture is authoritative because God deals with us through this word. This authority is not an unproved postulate; rather, it is a demonstrable reality, a moral-spiritual power. Here we have to do with the self-authenticating power of Scripture, the testimonium spiritus sancti. The limits of Scripture authority are not

1 Ibid., pp. 109 ff.: "Fuer diese Einheit hat die Religion der Offenbarung in der heiligen Schrift den Begriff der (Heiligkeit) Gottes gepraegt, ἡ δυνάμις oder δύναμις . . . Daher kommt es, dass die Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Gottes Gegenstand der Verheissung und Hoffnung Israels ist, dass sie die Verkuendigung der Geburt Christi begleitet, Luk. 2,9, in Christo Gegenwart gewinnt, Joh. 1,14; 2,11, in seiner Auferweckung durch seine Rechtfertigung sich bethaetigt, Roem. 6,3; 1 Tim. 3,16, und doch erst bei seiner Wiederkunft rueckhaltlos erscheint, Matth. 16,27; 19,28; 25,31; 2 Thess. 1,9, u. a." Cremer has taken this directly from his semantic investigations. Cf. his article on δύναμις, ET, pp. 208 f.

2 Cf. Cremer, Troestet mein Volk, p. 15. Cf. Haussleiter, article "Cremer," PRE, XXIII, 331.

3 Martin Kaehler, "Nachruf," August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblaetter (Guetersloh, 1903), p. 39.

set by one's own personal experience, nor is historical criticism the final criterion. Kaehler has noted that while Cremer had due regard for historical and literary-critical problems, he did not consider them to be of primary importance. He looked upon the Word of God as a creative act imbedded in the historically-prepared body.¹

The semantic investigation of the New Testament word θεόπνευστος serves as the point of departure for Cremer's doctrine of inspiration.

θεόπνευστος does not mean "inspired" in the sense of the Latin inspirata. The Vulgate, which translates II Tim. 3.16, with omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata has not caught the proper sense of the passage. θεόπνευστος means either "filled with the Spirit of God" or "breathing divine Spirit".² The conception upon which the Church has traditionally based its doctrine of inspiration originated in the pagan Hellenistic sphere rather than in the realm of biblical thought.³ While the Old Testament and Jewish conceptions of inspiration allowed for the individuality and conscious activity of the writer, Hellenistic Judaism adopted the Greek idea of ecstasy (ἐκστασις) in which the writer was merely an unconscious, passive instrument in the hands of God. Philo, with his syncretistic tendency, knew nothing higher than this concept of ecstatic divination which he borrowed from the mystery cults. The same basically pagan idea appears again in the literature of the Early Church. The Apostolic Fathers spoke simply of the fact of

1 Kaehler, Wie Hermann Cremer wurde? p. 22.

2 Cremer, "Inspiration," PRE, IX, 184; cf. Cremer-Koegel, pp. 492 ff.; ET, pp. 730 f.; Glaube, Schrift, und heilige Geschichte, pp. 29 f.

3 Otto Weber, Grundlagen der Dogmatik, I, 253 f., makes use of this insight which he has borrowed from Cremer.

inspiration, but the Apologists of the second century emphasized the divine origin of the knowledge contained in Scripture and taught a¹ mechanical, mantic form of inspiration.

During the Middle Ages the doctrine of inspiration had its place within the framework of scholastic theology, but little real use was made of it. In the Reformation period Scripture came into its own again and its authority was vigorously and decisively maintained. Out of the later controversies with Rome there emerged the Protestant orthodox view of inspiration as set forth by Calov, Quenstedt, Baier, Hollaz, and others. Inspiration was extended to include the words of the Old Testament, and Voetius even went so far as to declare that the vowel points of the Massoretic text were inspired. The Greek text of the New Testament was said to be pure in style and free from all barbarisms and solecisms. Such a doctrine of inspiration was something totally new in the history² of the Church's interpretation of Scripture. The ancient Hellenistic, mantic concept was replaced by a mechanical concept which rigidly circumscribed the sphere in which the Holy Spirit could operate.

Cremer's formulation of the doctrine of inspiration is the direct result of his study of the biblical language, but he also owes something³ to the Reformers, to Bengel, and to his teacher Beck. For Cremer, inspir-

1 Cremer, op. cit., p. 187.

2 Ibid., p. 192. Cf. Karl Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, I/2, 583.

3 Both Luther and Bengel "waren gewiss, dort dem Worte des lebendigen Gottes zu begegnen, dem gegenueber der Mensch mit seiner Vernunft nicht Meister, sondern nur demuetiger Hoerer sein kann. Beide uebten dieses Hoeren in dem klaren Bewusstsein, dass Gott selbst die Tuere des Verstaendnisses aufschliessen muss durch seinen Geist, und dass ohne das der Mensch im Dunkeln tappt. Beide waren ueberzuegt, dass die Schrift am

ation is one of the mighty acts of God whereby He visits and redeems His¹ people. At this point Cremer is dependent upon Kaehler who regarded the Bible as the basic document of the preaching of Christ and of the salvation which comes through Him. In order to understand Scripture we must perceive the object of the Apostolic preaching, namely, God's redemptive acts as they are brought together in Christ and made real and present in Him. The whole of Scripture has to do with redemptive events as they have² occurred in a particular history, the history between God and man.

Inspiration is the peculiar function of the Holy Spirit Who is active in the history of redemption. Through Him God communicates Himself to His witnesses. There is a marked difference between God's self-communication in the Old Testament and in the New. In the Old Testament God revealed Himself from afar; in the New Testament redemption has drawn nigh; it is³ a present reality. Cremer asserted that "the connection between the Old

besten selbst auslegt, ihr eigenes Licht ist." Karl Hermann, Johann Albrecht Bengel, pp. 396-97.

1 Cremer, op. cit., p. 394: "... die Anknuepfung liegt in der Bengelschen Schule, deren edelste und verheissungsvollste Frucht die Erkenntnis ist, welche Gottfr. Menken im Jahre 1793 dahin zusammenfasste: 'Die Bibel ist keine Dogmatik . . ., sie ist vielmehr ein geschichtliches, harmonisches Ganzes. Alles, was sie lehrt, lehrt sie uns entweder unmittelbar in Geschichte oder es ruht doch auf Geschichte, hat seinen Grund und sein Licht in der Geschichte' (Daemonologie S. 153, Werke VII, 68)."

2 Ibid., p. 220.

3 Ibid., pp. 200 f. Here Cremer has quoted from his Woerterbuch verbatim: "Von der Mitteilung des goettlichen Wortes an die Propheten heisst es durchgaengig $\text{דְּבַר יְהוָה הָיָה אֵלַי}$ (vgl. Jo. 10,35) und von dem Vernehmen dieses Wortes (דְּבַר יְהוָה) Jes. 2,1; Mi.1,1; Am 1,1, vgl. Ps. 89,20; Jes. 13,1; 1 Chr 25,5. Nur vereinzelt und nur ausserordentlicherweise wird die Entfernung (Entfremdung) zwischen Gott und den Menschen durchbrochen und ueberbrueckt . . . Im NT ist das Wort, der Ausdruck des Heilswillens Gottes, aus seiner Ferne und Verborgenheit in die Weltgegenwart eingetreten in Christo, Roe 10,5-8; Tit 1,3; Akt 10,36; 13,26 . . ." Cf. the article on $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, Woerterbuch, 6th ed., pp. 561 f.

and New Testament 'word of God' is of great significance . . . in its bearing upon the doctrine of inspiration".¹ The New Testament declaration of salvation is determined by the redemptive act which has taken place objectively in Christ and which enters subjectively into the personal life through the indwelling of the Spirit. Inspiration, however, is not simply the communion of the Holy Spirit as shared by the Church in all ages; it is the special gift of the Apostolic witnesses.² These eyewitnesses experience the event of salvation and are especially endowed with the capacity to proclaim it.

The language of Scripture is bound up with the redemptive history which it relates. The redemption that has taken place in Christ is an all-embracing event which even affects human speech. A new creation means a

1 Cremer, ET, p. 396.

2 "Die Inspiration ist ihre Amtsgnade, ihr Charisma, welches sie befähigt, ungeachtet der individuellen, allgemein menschlichen sowohl wie schuldhaften Unvollkommenheit (Ga 2, vgl. mit 1 Kor 9, 16 ff.) zu einer fuer alle Zeit grundlegenden und massgebenden Aussage der Heilsthatsachen und ihrer Bedeutung." Cremer, op. cit., pp. 201-202. In dieser Art etwa wuerde Wesen und Art der Inspiration sich aus der Geschichte der Offenbarung selbst ergeben. . . . Die Inspiration ist das Gegenteil von Aufhebung der menschlichen Selbststaendigkeit, - vielmehr bezw. Umwandlung derselben; sie ist nicht Herablassung zur menschlichen Eigenart, sonder Heiligung bezw. Umwandlung derselben, damit die Person in ihrer Eigenart selbstaendig eintrete fuer Gottes Werk und Willen." Ibid., p. 203.

Cf. Cremer's article "Prinzipienlehre" in Zoeckler's Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, II 658: "Da es inspiration aber nur gewirkt sein kann durch sein Objekt, naemlich durch die Heilsoffenbarung oder die Heilsthatsache selbst, so setzt es zugleich ein besonderes Verhaeltnis derselben, eine besondere Selbstbeziehung Gottes in Christo zu diesen zeugen voraus, welche ihrer besonderen Berufsaufgabe entspricht (sogen. Inspiration) und welche auf einer Linie liegt mit der goettlichen Ausruestung zu jedem besonderen Beruf und Dienst behufs der Heilsabsichten und innerhalb der Heilsgemeinde Gottes."

Cf. also P. Gennrich, Der Kampf um die Schrift in der deutsch-evangelischen Kirche des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1898), pp. 72 f.

new language. Through the action of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost the future broke in upon the present.¹ The Spirit is the agent through whom God performs all His mighty acts, and through the working of the Spirit upon the words of Scripture we are enabled to participate in these acts.² In this sense it is quite correct to speak, as Richard Rothe did, of a "language of the Holy Ghost".³ God's self-revelation does transform, but

1 "'Das Wort neu ist ein recht apokalypt. Wort: neuer Name, neues Lied, neuer Himmel, neue Erde, neu Jerusalem, alles neu,' (Bengel zu Apk. 2,17). In diesem Zusammenhange hat es auch Bedeutung, wenn von d. παραουσία d. Rede ist . . ." Cremer-Koegel, p. 551. ". . . es ist d. Charisma, in einer d. Weltleben fremden Form zu Gott zu reden in d. Sprache d. neuen Welt, d. Erloesten u. Seligen." Ibid., p. 261. Cf. Cremer, Das Wort vom Kreuz, p. 329.

2 The same Spirit which effects God's mighty deeds (e.g., the conception, birth, baptism, temptation, and resurrection of Christ) enlightens our understanding and makes us participators in these events (Jn. 14.26, 15.26, Acts 2.32 f., Rom. 8.16). See Cremer-Koegel, pp. 940 ff. Cf. Cremer, ET, p. 508.

3 Rothe, whose habit of thought was synthetic, objected to the Aristotelian distinction between form and content: "Ueberhaupt wer kann in dem Lebendigen Gehalt und Form auseinanderlesen? . . . je reiner und lebendiger die Rede ist, desto unaufloeslicher ist in ihr die Einheit von Inhalt und Form. Die Inspiration der Worte kann daher von der der Sachen nicht getrent werden . . . Man kann in der That mit gutem Fug von einer 'Sprache des heiligen Geistes' reden. Denn es liegt in der Bibel offen vor unseren Augen, wie der in der Offenbarung wirksame goettliche Geist jedesmal aus der Sprache desjenigen Volkskreises, welcher den Schauplatz jener ausmachte, sich eine ganz eigenthuemlich religioese Mundart gebildet hat, indem er die sprachlichen Elemente, die er vorfand, ebenso wie die schon vorhandenen Begriffe, zu einer ihm eigenthuemlich angemessenen Gestalt umformte. Am evidentesten veranschaulicht das Griechische des Neuen Testaments diesen Hergang." Richard Rothe, Zur Dogmatik (Gotha, 1869) pp. 232-34. Cf. Wach, Das Verstehen, II, 287 f.

The following excerpts show how Cremer regarded the language of Scripture in the light of the Spirit's work: ". . . wenn es von eine Sprache des heiligen Geistes die Rede ist, die den Lauten nach uebereinstimmend mit der Sprache des natuerlichen Lebens, dem Sinne. u. Gehalte nach erfuehlt ist vom heiligen Geist, welcher als Geist eines neuen Lebens sich entweder eine neue Sprachform wie am ersten Pfingstfest schafft, oder die alten Formen mit neuem, einer oberen Welt angehorigen Gehalte fuehlt. . . . Wort

not in any purely external sense. It is precisely at this point, as we noted earlier, that Cremer must be criticized. Contrary to his expectation, the transformation in the language cannot be isolated philologically as a peculiar proof of the Spirit's working but must ever remain an act of God's sovereign freedom. Later theologians, notably Karl Barth, have made important advances in this area. Barth has explored the problem of the relationship between word and object and shows how the word of Scripture, which is a genuine human word, points beyond itself to its object.¹ We are not to be concerned with the language for its own sake, but are to focus our attention on the thing signified. The words of Scripture have a peculiar object, one which cannot be mastered by us in the usual way. God's self-revelation as we encounter it in the words of Scripture remains a mystery, yet it stands unambiguously before us as genuine object.²

Reconciliation and Redemption

The content of dogmatics may be controlled by the language of Scripture itself; that has become clear from our study of Cremer's treatment of the doctrine of the divine attributes and of the doctrine of inspir-

und Sache sind etwas dem N. T. eigenthuemliches. . . ." Der biblische Begriff der Erbauung (Barmen, 1863), p. 3. "Was waere das griechisch redende Volk fuer ein Volk geworden, wenn diese aus neuen Herzen stromende Sprache in ihre Herzen alle gedrunken waere! Die erste Gabe Gottes an den Menschen in Paradiese auch hier so wundersam wiederholt und auf groesseres weissagend, wie aus Roem 8,26 zu sehen. . . . Und doch wie bald wieder entwuerdigt, wie die Kirchensprache zeigt. . . . Die beiden Schriftsprachen sind jetzt tot. . . . Jedoch, wenn auch die Heiden gerichtet werden und Israel eingeht, wird ein neues kommen. Bis dahin suchen wir in unsern Sprachen durch das Studium der Alten das rechte Wort des Zeugnisses." From a letter to Kaehler dated 4th Jan. 1860. Quoted by Kaehler in Wie Hermann Cremer wurde?

1 Karl Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, 1/2, p. 513.

2 Ibid., p. 521.

ation. From Scripture the theologian will obtain a non-philosophical, non-Hellenistic foundation upon which to build. For another example of the way in which semantic studies may be appropriated in dogmatics we turn to the results of Cremer's investigation of those New Testament words which have to do with atonement and reconciliation. In the light of these results it appears that the substitutionary theory of the atonement is not an invention of the theologians; for the concept of substitution is deeply imbedded in the language of the New Testament. Behind certain terms used to describe the atoning work of Christ we can detect the influence of the Old Testament institutions of priesthood and sacrifice:

All O. T. sacrifices . . . have especial reference to sin . . . for righteousness' sake, an expiation of sin is necessary (a substitutionary suffering of the punishment, see $\thetaύσις$) . . . priest and sacrifice together constitute the substitutionary presentation of what the sacrifice is intended for. Christ, as at once priest and sacrifice, is that sacrifice and that priest of whom men stood in need; with Him sacrifices as previously offered cease . . . Redemption as the result of expiation, this is the prominent thought in the N. T; view of salvation . . .¹

Cremer makes full use of the New Testament language of atonement and propitiation in a chapter in his Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre entitled: "The Connection Between Justification and the Death and Resurrection of Christ". In His death upon the Cross Christ bore God's judgment upon our sins. What He suffered we deserved to suffer, but if we had, we would have been lost. Christ as our $\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\omega$)

1 See Cremer, ET, on $\thetaύσις$, pp. 291-92; $\dot{\iota}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, p. 303; , p. 409. In sharp contrast, Adolf Deissmann approaches the N. T. language of propitiation via the contemporary Hellenistic usage rather than in terms of the Old Testament. See his article, " $\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ und $\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$. Eine lexikalische Studie," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, IV (1903), 193-212.

suffered death in our stead (Rom. 3.25).¹ God ordained that Christ should be born within Israel, under the Law, and that He should be treated as though He were sinful and accursed. The sin committed against Him became² the means through which the sins of the world are forgiven. Christ is justified through His Resurrection, and thereby the whole world of sinners is justified. Christ's objective, vicarious sacrifice is appropriated³ subjectively by faith.

Two little books by Cremer, Gethsemane and Ueber den Zustand nach den Tod, afford a further opportunity to observe Cremer's views concerning the biblical doctrine of redemption as he found it set forth in the language of the New Testament. From the very beginning Jesus' solitary way

1 Christus hat in seinem Tod von Gott her etwas erlitten, was nicht ihm, sondern uns zugekommen waere, wodurch wir aber verloren gewesen waeren. Christus ist es, der das Gottesgericht ueber unsere Suede erlitten hat. Wie das denkbar ist, wird sich nachher zeigen muessen.
 ἱλάσκεσθαι resp. ἕξιλάσκεσθαι bezeichnet im alttestamentlichen Kultus nicht wie sonst im Griechischen 'die Gottheit geneigt machen'; nie ist Gott das Objekt der betreffenden Handlung. Es liegen der Suehne auf aussertestamentlichem Gebiete Vorstellungen zu Grunde, die der Offenbarungsreligion vollstaendig fremd sind. Gottes Gesinnung bedarf nicht der Wandlung. Dagegen bedarf. es einer Opfersuehne zu dem Zwecke, damit Gott nicht genoetigt werde, ein anderes Verhalten einzuschlagen. Mit dieser allerdings fundamentalen Veraenderung ist ἱλάσκεσθαι, ἕξιλάσκεσθαι in den biblischen Schatz uebergegangen . . . Cremer, Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, pp. 431 f.

2 "So hat Christi Leiden und Sterben stellvertretende Bedeutung, indem sein Leiden an die Stelle des sonst ueber die Welt ergehenden Gerichtes getreten ist, welchem die Heiden von Anfang an verfallen waren, und welchem auch Israel nicht entgehen koennte." Ibid., p. 435.

3 Ibid., p. 430.

led Him toward the Cross: "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened until it be accomplished" (Lk. 12.49).¹ Cremer notes how the Last Supper links the Old Exodus with the New Exodus. As Jesus and His disciples commemorated the past deliverance out of Egypt they² looked toward the redemption now immediately at hand. His death is the first phase of this mighty redemptive act:

As he hung upon the cursed tree, and suffered what did not belong to him, viz., the wage and curse of our sin, in him was found the representative and mediator for us, and our redemption was accomplished. He placed himself in our ranks and became like one of us in order to share with us, life and death, and to help us by his sacrifice. . . . He needed not to die, and yet he died. Else had the judgment then fallen on the world. But now his death has taken the place of the judgment, and the world is reconciled.³

The second and culminating phase of the redemptive act is the Resurrection:

This is now the significance of the resurrection of Christ, that Jesus has actually accomplished the work for which he died on the cross, according to the word of Paul, "Jesus was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Rom. iv. 25). . . . He is now the first-fruits of the redeemed, the first-born from the dead. . . . Thus we may perceive by Christ's resurrection how necessarily redemption and resurrection belong together. . . .⁴

1 "Er war dazu geboren, dass er sterben sollte . . . Die Lage wird immer gespannter . . . ich muss mich zuvor taufen lassen mit einer Taufe, und wie ist mir so bange, bis sie vollendet werde!" Cremer, Gethsemane Ein Beitrage zum Verstaendnis der Geschichte Jesu und unserer Erloesung (Guetersloh: 1903), p. 36.

2 "Jesus staerkt sich mit seinen Juengern an dem Gedaechnis der Erloesung Israels aus Aegyptenland und aus dem Diensthause und an der Verheissung der Erloesung, die jetzt kommen sollte." Ibid., p. 37 Cf. Cremer, ET, p. 103.

3 Cremer, Beyond the Grave, trans. Samuel T. Lowrie (New York, 1886), pp. 60f.

4 Ibid., pp. 59 f., 61 f.

On the basis of Christ's Resurrection one can speak of a bodily resurrection for all believers. The New Testament does not teach a doctrine of the immortality of the soul. "We must learn to think and feel in a more realistic fashion," says Cremer. Man's body "has become the mortal body of the sinful flesh, the body of sin and death". The whole man experiences the consequences of his sin, and "the present life, even in its beginning, is under the influence of its end, that is, of death."² But it is possible even now for us to experience redemption:

What we have in the believing possession of redemption is the beginning of eternal life even in this life, and this is the opposite of what we brought with us into the world by our birth, viz., death. . . . The renewing that happens to us in the communion of Christ is already an actual participation in the resurrection.³

While we participate inwardly in redemption now, we look forward to the final consummation, the bodily resurrection of those who are in Christ:

We stand between the two Easters. By virtue of the first Easter we go to meet the last Easter, if we have entered into possession of the redemption purchased for us. . . . The resurrection is the key-stone in the process of realizing in us the redemption that has been accomplished for us. In it and along with it will be renewed all that death has destroyed then will be manifest the glorious freedom of the children of God, in which all creation will participate. Then all things will become new . . .⁴

1 Ibid., pp. 19 f., 56.

2 Ibid., pp. 21 f.

3 Ibid., p. 68.

4 Ibid., pp. 65, 77.

CHAPTER VIII

AN INTEGRATED THEOLOGICAL METHOD

Cremer's Sermons

Cremer's academic career lasted for thirty-three years.

During this whole time (1870-1903) he occupied the chair of dogmatics at the University of Greifswald. Yet even in his role as university professor he remained a pastor at heart. He always remembered the lessons he had learned during his eleven years as a parish minister. It can never be said of him that he stood aloof from the problems of everyday life or that his theology was unrelated to the main mission of the Church, which is to win men for Jesus Christ. In addition to his duties as a professor he was for twenty-five years minister of preaching at the Marienkirche in the city of Greifswald. While this double responsibility prevented him from writing as prolifically as he would have wished, it enabled him to demonstrate to his students that theological studies can have a direct and vital relationship to the preaching ministry. It is no coincidence that Cremer's most popular course at Greifswald was his homiletical seminar.¹

The biblical theology which flows forth from the language of the Old and New Testaments appears again in Cremer's sermons. The cardinal emphases gleaned from his exegetical labors are most clearly reflected in two volumes of his published sermons; Troestet mein Volk!, in which all the texts are taken from the Old Testament, and Christus ist mein Leben,

¹ See E. Cremer, Hermann Cremer, pp. 170, 327; and K. Bornhaeuser, "Im homiletischen Seminar bei Prof. Cremer," Gedenkblaetter, pp. 119ff.

a collection of sermons dealing with the person and work of Christ. The manner in which he has worked biblico-theological themes into the body of his sermons can best be understood by examining a number of passages from Troestet mein Volk! in which references to particular theological subjects occur. The following excerpts have been arranged according to subject-matter.

Promise and fulfilment. - - So wird es hier vom Herrn seinem Knechte Elias, dem Vorbilde Johannis des Täuflers gezeigt [I.Kings 19.4-18]. . . . Da laesst der Herr im Zeichen ihm seinen Willen deutlich werden und deutet ihm mit Worten der Verheissung - wie Jesus dem Täufler in der Gefangenschaft seine Wunder verkündigen laesst zum Zeichen, dass die Zeit erfuellet sei So soll denn die Geschichte Elias auf Horeb uns die Herrlichkeit Gottes in seiner Verheissung und in der Erfuellung deuten.¹ Da spricht der Herr, er gedenke an seinen Bund und an das Wort der Verheissung, und er wolle sein Wort halten und seinen Gnadenbund nicht hinfaellig werden lassen [Exodus 6.1-9].² Nicht mit einem Schlage ist die Verheissung in Erfuellung gegangen. Zurueckgefuehrt hat Gott der Herr sein Volk in das Land seiner Vaeter, dass es dort des Heilands wartete und warten sollte der ganzen Erfuellung. [Isaiah 36.22-32].³ Man nicht muede wird immer von neuem ihm zu danken fuer die Offenbarung seiner Liebe und die Erfuellung seiner Verheissung und fuer die Hoffnung, die er uns gibt, deren endliche Erfuellung uns die Ausgiessung des heiligen Geistes verbuergt.⁴

Israel's God is the Living God. - - Die Macht des Widerstandes gegen Gott und Gottes Wort und Wille ist viel zu gross in uns allen, als dass sie anders sollte gebrochen werden koennen, als durch eine starke Hand, durch die Hand des lebendigen Gottes [Exodus 3.15-20]. . . . In des lebendigen Gottes Namen tritt Elias, bis dahin unbekannt vor den abgoettischen Koenig Israels [I Kings 17.1-16] Gebete erhoeren, das kann nur der lebendige Gott [I Kings 18.17-39] Er hat Gotte gefunden, den lebendigen Gott, und weiss, woran er sich zu halten hat im Leben und im Sterben [II Kings 5.1-17].⁵

1 Hermann Cremer, Troestet mein Volk! (Guetersloh, 1909), p. 12.

2 Ibid., p. 21.

3 Ibid., p. 187.

4 Ibid., p. 190.

5 Ibid., pp. 62, 215, 223, 257.

Heilsgeschichte: the miracle of judgment and grace. - -

Darum ist die Bibel das Buch der Wunder; die ganze Geschichte, die sie uns berichtet die sich begeben hat zwischen Gott und Menschen, damit unsre Erloesung zustande kaeme, und wir nun glauben koennten, eine Geschichte der Wunder Gottes. Die feurige Glut, und doch nicht verzehrt, die Wunderbare Erfahrung, von der uns die ganze biblische Geschichte und jedes Wunder Jesu Zeugnis gibt, um es immer wieder zu sagen, was wir unter dem Kreuze des Heilandes erkennen: Gottes Sohn fuer mich gekreuzigt, und ich nicht gerichtet, sondern gerettet. Darum geht dies Wunder der Erloesung Israels voraus, um fuer alle Zeiten als ein Zeichen uns zu dienen . . . Du bist der Dornbusch, der Herr ist das Feuer, und du wirst doch nicht verzehrt, sondern gerettet. [Exodus 3.1-12.]¹ Hier handelt es sich darum, Aegyptens Macht zu brechen . . . fuer Aegypten ein Strafgericht, fuer Israel Wunder der Gnade. . . [Exodus 3. 15-20].

Israel's redemption from Egypt and redemption through Christ.

- - Im genauen Zusammenhange mit der ewigen Erloesung steht die Erloesung aus Aegypten . . . So gewiss Israel durch Gottes Hand erloest war aus der Knechtschaft und dem Elend Aegyptens, so gewiss und sicher sollte es nun der kuenftigen Erloesung, der endlichen Erfuellung der Verheissung von der Erloesung der Welt sein [Deuteronomy 8.6-20].²

Sacrifice and atonement. - - (1) Abraham's sacrifice [Genesis

22.1-14]. Wohl war's ein bitteres, herzdurchbohrendes Wort, das Wort des Herrn: Nimm deinen Sohn Isaak, den du liebst . . . Isaak, der Verheissung Erbe, soll ein Opfer sein, damit er selbst die Verheissung ererbe! . . . wer die Verheissung bringen soll, der muss ein Opfer werden. Freilich, wie kann man sterben, den Opfertod erleiden und doch leben? . . . Ein anderes Opfer tritt fuer uns ein, an Isaaks Stelle, an unsere Stelle. - Er sorgt fuer das Opfer, das wir sonst bringen mussten.³

(2) The High Priest on the Day of Atonement [Leviticus 16.29-34]. Das war die Ordnung des grossen Versoehnungstages in Israel, an dem der Hehepriester alle Jahre einmal in das Allerheiligste eingehen musste, und opfern fuer die Suende des Volkes. . . . Es war ein Gottesdienst, der Gottesdienst Israels, so ernst wie wir es uns kaum denken koennen. Blut und Feur, die Zeichen des Gerichtes Gottes, waren seine Zeichen . . . Wir haben ein Opfer fuer die Suende, das ewiglich gilt; wir haben einen Hohenpriester, der sich selbst geopfert hat fuer uns; wir singen; Hoechster Priester, der du dich selbst geopfert hast fuer mich!⁴

1 Ibid., pp. 59, 61-63.

2 Ibid., p. 69; cf. p. 249.

3 Ibid., pp. 105, 107.

4 Ibid., pp. 110-111, 113.

(3) The atoning sacrifice of Christ . . . Fuerwahr, er trug unsere Krankheit und lud auf sich unsere Schmerzen . . . Christie Leiden ist anders, als sonst ein Leiden in der Welt gewesen ist und sein wird. Er steht der ganzen Welt gegenueber - er der Reine, wir die Unreinen, er der eingeborene Sohn des Vaters, wir die Abgewichene verlorenen Kinder, er der Herr ueber alles, ueber Himmel und Erde, wir die Welt die ihres Richters wartet . . . Er leidet, was nicht ihm, sondern uns zukommt, - er stirbt, und das Gericht geht nicht ueber die Welt. . . . Er leidet wie ein Suender - den Tod der Suender, von Gott verlassen, als waere er nicht der eingeborene Sohn des Vaters, er leidet von den Suendern, der Hirt von seiner Herde, die er sammeln und hueten, und ewig retten will, und keiner ist, der ihm dankt, der ihn versteht. . . . Dort ist die Strafe von uns genommen, auf dass wir Frieden haetten. Er hat sich selbst fuer uns geopfert, fuer die ganze suendige Welt, dass sie um seines Leidens und Sterbens willen leben sollte. [Isaiah 53.4-5.]¹

Christ's redemptive power . . . Wer auf ihn blickt, der hat das Licht der Welt und wandelt nicht in Finsternis, und hat das Licht des Lebens . . . Das ist die Kraft . . . um alles zu tun, was wir zu tun haben, im Amt und Beruf und taeglicher Arbeit, um alles zu tragen, was icht zu tragen habe . . . Wie er dort auf dem Berge sein und selig werden koennten, entgegenkam mit dem Wort: selig sind die geistlich Armen, selig sind die Leidtragenden, selig sind die da hungert und duerstet nach Gerechtigkeit . . . grundlos barmherzige Liebe ist sein Wesen. Es ist kein Kranker, den er nicht troesten will; es ist kein dunkles Trauerhaus, darin er nicht eintreten will; es ist kein erschrockenes Gewissen das er nicht heilen will - er sucht das Elend, dazu ist er vom Himmel herabgekommen. . . . Die Gestalt, in der er vor uns steht als der Gekreuzigte und Auferstandene und zur Rechten Gottes Erhoete, es ist die Gestalt des barmherzigen Hohenpriesters, der da selig kann und will immerdar, die durch ihn zu Gott kommen. [Isaiah 61.1-3.]²

The new heavens and the new earth. - - Der Neujahrstag ist ein Tag wie alle Tage, und doch ein Festtag - nicht wie die andern Feste der Christenheit, die von den grossen Taten Gottes zeugen, die fuer uns geschehen sind, und doch auch ein Gedankentag der grossen Taten Gottes - ein Gedenktag nicht der Vergangenheit, sondern der Zukunft Zu erwarten haben wir nur Gericht - endloses Gericht und endgueltiges ewiges Gericht und Verurteilung der Welt, die wir missbraucht haben und erfuehlt mit unserer Suende . . . Da verheisst er: Siehe, ich will einen neuen Himmel und eine neue Erde schaffen - das Sehnen eures Herzens und die Gebete der Seinen sollen nicht unerfuehlt und unerhoert bleiben - es soll alles, alles neu werden. . . . Nicht in uns - weder in

1 Ibid., pp. 118-119.

2 Ibid., pp. 244-245.

unserm ernsten Streben, noch in der Entwicklung unserer Faehigkeiten liegt die Buergschaft. Sie liegt allein im Worte Gottes . . . [Isaiah 65.17-19; cf. Rev. 21.1].¹

A Critical Problem

The foregoing selections reveal the very heart of Cremer's proclamation of the Gospel. His message is richly interwoven with images from the Old Testament, and God's costly work of atonement and reconciliation in Christ is set forth with great earnestness and power. This is language which speaks to the heart and reawakens one's own experience of God's saving grace. It should be born in mind, however, that there are many more elements in biblical theology which have not found a place in Cremer's sermons; for example, the miracles, the angels and demons, the cosmic catastrophe of the end-time. We saw earlier how Cremer found a place for these within the total framework of Heilsgeschichte, and yet the need to interpret these features of biblical theology in our own teaching ministry leads us to ask an embarrassing question. Is the primitive Weltanschauung of the New Testament really an indispensable part of the Gospel? Is it desirable or possible to incorporate these primitive elements into one's own theological statements? Does the kind of material which biblical theologians like Cremer have brought to light have any genuine relevance for the modern man who lives in a scientific age? These, in effect, are the questions which Rudolf Bultmann has asked. The publication of his essay "New Testament and Mythology" touched off a heated controversy among scholars and theologians.² The furor caused by Bultmann's

1 Ibid., pp. 44-45.

2 The following quotation from Bultmann is indicative of his attitude toward N.T. theology: "A blind acceptance of the New Testament mythology would be

proposals for de-mythologizing the New Testament brings to mind the attempt made by Harnack more than a generation ago to make the Gospel relevant by stripping away what he deemed to be the non-essentials. Cremer was one of Harnack's most vigorous opponents, and it is easy to determine what his position would be on this whole matter. Cremer argued that the experience of redemption in the life of the individual is grounded upon concrete historical events which are mediated to us through the Apostolic proclamation.¹ We have to reckon with the Hebraic background of the New Testament kerygma and give full credence to the part which history played in the religious life of Israel. The New Testament writers did not distinguish between idea and event; the objective reality of God's self-revelation is contained in the subjective experience of redemption.² "Either the old Gospel wins hearts anew or they will positively not be won," declared Cremer.³ The

irrational . . . it is no longer possible for one to hold the New Testament view of the world. The mythical eschatology is untenable . . . We know that the stars are physical bodies . . . and not daemonic beings which enslave mankind to their services . . . The miracles of the New Testament have ceased to be miraculous . . ." Rudolf Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," in Kerygma and Myth, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (London, 1954), pp. 1 ff.

1 Hermann Cremer, Die Aufgabe und Bedeutung der Predigt in der gegenwaertigen Krisis (Berlin, 1892), p. 104.

2 "Die Predigt Jesu u. der Apostel sich durchweg in Gedankenkreisen, Auffassungen u. Auspraegungen bewegte, welche dem Geistesleben Israels entnommen und daher Israel so kongenial, den Griechen so wenig kongenial waren wie nur moeglich. . . Wenn das aber die sonderlichen thaten Gottes an seinem Volke gleichsetzt mit der allgemeinen Vorsehung Gottes, welche Natur und Geschichte durchwaltet, so ist es ein alter Irrtum, naemlich der Irrtum der alexandrinischen Schule." Ibid., pp. 76 ff.

3 Ibid., p. 89.

Apostolic preaching is normative for all preaching:

All that we know of Christ rests upon the testimony of the Apostles. They speak and testify of the things which they saw and heard . . . not as disinterested witnesses, but as witnesses who also understand the importance of all which they had experienced, and who try to help us to a like understanding and possession. . . . The apostolic preaching of the Gospel not merely contains but is truly the eternal Gospel.¹

The kerygma includes "his miracles, and also the miracles which were wrought on Him; His birth, His endowment with the Spirit of God beyond measure, His transfiguration, His resurrection and ascension."² Jesus Himself lends credibility to the miracles, for His own life and work is the greatest miracle of all:

We believe not in Jesus for the sake of the miracles, but we believe the miracles for Jesus' sake. The history of Jesus were not the history of the Messiah . . . if it were not at the same time a history full of wonders. They belong to the history and cannot be separated from it. . . . The Messiah, the anointed of God . . . is God yet became man in order to be wholly and forever with us, and to be everything that He is for our benefit The resurrection is a miracle - it is the decisive miracle; on it depends all that concerns Jesus. The incarnation, however, is the greater miracle and the greatest of all miracles to which the resurrection leads us.³

The incarnation and the resurrection were experienced by the Apostles; hence, they are not myths, and the resurrection can also be experienced by us. We have to do with "the absolutely free action of the ever-living God, who will live with us and for us . . .".⁴

1 Hermann Cremer, A Reply to Harnack on the Essence of Christianity, trans. Bernhard Pick (New York, 1903), p. 374

2 Ibid., p. 9.

3 Ibid., pp. 208, 164.

4 Ibid., p. 249. See the article on μαρτυρος, μαρτύριον, μαρτυρία in Cremer-Koegel, pp. 715 f.: "Sie the Apostles sagen aus und bestaetigen durch ihre eigene Erfahrung, was von Christus gilt . . . Die Heilsverkuendigung (μαρτύριον) eine Wiedergabe tatsaechliche feststehender Wahrheit ist"

One may feel that Cremer has no satisfactory answer to many of the religious-historical and form-critical questions which have been raised by Bultmann and others, but he is on essentially the right path when he insists that the New Testament makes its claim upon us, not through cognitive understanding of a Weltanschauung, but through a redemptive life-experience.¹

Christ pro nobis

Cremer stresses over and over again that it is really the presence of the living Christ which makes the Gospel relevant:

Jesus is present where His Word is preached, His name is acknowledged, His love is praised. This we feel, and with it we feel that He is more than a personage of history. He is indeed a personage of history, of our history. But He is more than this; He is superhistorical. He entered into history . . . for our benefit . . . the helper whom the two greatest world powers, sin and death, can not separate from us. He not only became alive then, but He has lived ever since, and everything that He was as He lived before, lives again with Him . . . He still lives, not merely has lived . . . Wherever His Gospel is preached unto us; all that He did, spoke, suffered; all that happened to Him. Hearing it, we have, after all, to deal with Himself. . . . We are transferred into His very presence. That is a wonderful effect . . . an effect which no other word has. . .²

1 See Cremer's statement in Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes, p. 37: "Die Offenbarung Gottes in Christo fuer uns nicht eine blosses Thatsache der Geschichte, der Vergangenheit, sondern in vollsten Sinne Gegenwart ist, der historische Christus der lebendige, uns gegenwaertige Christus, der 'gestern, heute und in Ewigkeit derselbe ist,' nicht bloss, als waere er uns gegenwaertige, sondern wirklich uns gegenwaertig. Cf. Cremer's Prinzipienlehre, p. 640. The de-mythologizing controversy did not begin with Bultmann by any means. As long ago as 1835 J.T. Beck published an essay entitled: "Ueber die mythische Auffassung der neutestamentlichen Evangeliumurkunden" (Tuebinger Zeitschrift, IV, 63 ff.).

2 Cremer, A Reply to Harnack, pp. 130-137. "Das Bekenntnis ist nicht blosser Zustimmung zu einem Lehrsatz, sondern Ausdruck des persoennlichen Verhaeltnisses zu dem, dass man bekennet . . ." Cremer, Rechtfertigungslehre, p. 317. "Die Bewirkung unseres Glaubens auf die Macht Gottes zurueckgefuehrt wird, und zwar auf dieselbe Macht, die Christum auferweckt und erhoet hat." Cremer, Eigenschaften Gottes, p. 79.

Let us examine Cremer's message about the risen, glorified, ever-present Christ as he has presented it in his own sermons. The following excerpts are from the volume entitled: Christus ist mein Leben.

The presence of the living Christ is not an idea, but an experienced event. -- Das ist das Fluch des Studierens . . . dass wir eine Empfindung davon bekommen, was fuer ein Unterschied ist zwischen Gedanken, zwischen Formeln und Wahrheit und Leben Wenn wir ein Wort Jesu hoeren, wenn uns Jesu Name und durch Jesum unsere Eloesung verkuendigt wird, machen wir die eigenthuemliche Erfahrung . . . wo sein Wort, sein Name genannt wird, da ist er selber und wirkt vom Himmel in Kraft seines Heiligen Geistes . . . Man sieht ihn und weiss: es ist doch etwas ganz Besonderes um ihn. Sein Auge - das Auge meines Bruders, aber so hat mich noch nie mein Bruder angesehen. Die Hand, die er mir reicht, die Hand des Bruders, des Freundes, die Hand des Vaters; so hat noch nie jemand mir die Hand aufs Haupt gelegt . . . wie Jesus . . . Jesu Wort hoerst du, Jesu Stimme . . .¹

We experience grace where we had no right to experience anything but judgment. -- Der, der vor ihr stand, war derselbe Jesus Christus, gestern und heute und in Ewigkeit derselbe, der einst ihr geholfen, der, der einst zu ihr und so zu vielen Mueden geredet hatte, der am Kreuz gehaengen und fuer seine Moerders gebetet. Er steht vor ihr, der Fuerst des Lebens, der, den der Tod nicht halten konnte . . . Und wenn die Herrlichkeit noch so gross ist, ich werde es fuehlen: ich muesste zu seinen Fuessen fallen wie ein Toter; aber was er einst gesagt hat: Fuerchte dich nicht! Ich bin der erste und der Letzte und der Lebendige; ich war tot, und siehe, ich bin lebendig von ewigkeit zu ewigkeit und habe die Schluessl der Hoelle und des Todes - das gilt auch mir! Denkst du er freute sich ueber deine Begeisterung fuer ihn, denkst du, er freute sich ueber Ewigkeitsregung deines Herzens? Denkst du er freute sich ueber das, was du bisher dich gehalten und was du bisher geleistet? . . . Nicht ein Menschenherz auf Erden, das ihm treu geblieben waere und das um der Treue willen haette gerettet werden koennen! . . . "Mir ist Barmherzigkeit widerfahren!" I Tim. 1.16 . . . Es war kein Lehrsatz, dessen Erkenntnis den Apostel so begeistert, dass er allenthalben umherzog, diesen einen Satz zu vertreten. Fuer einen Lehrsatz lebt man nicht, und fuer einen Lehrsatz stirbt man nicht. . . . Das ist eine Tatsache, eine Tatsache seines innersten Lebens.²

1 Hermann Cremer, Christus ist mein Leben (Guetersloh, 1906), pp. 22 f., 88, 24, 225.

2 Ibid., pp. 79, 225, 64, 99 f.

Cremer has painted a word-picture of the living Christ, a picture in which many biblical images flow together to form one image, but this is far more than an image in the mind's eye. This glorious Christ who stands before us is a consuming fire who burns His way into our own innermost hearts. He brings judgment, and yet we are not destroyed, but healed, restored, forgiven, begotten anew! We have now reached the point in this dissertation where we can clearly see how the different elements from biblical language and biblical theology fuse into one living whole. But this fusion is not something which can take place within a theological system, or through language alone, or through images in the mind, or through feelings of deepest spiritual ecstasy. Cremer deserves no special credit for the miraculous event which has taken place. He is simply seeking to share something which ought to be the experience of every believing Christian. It is not the quality of his scholarship (there are many deficiencies to be found in his work) nor the quality of his own religious life (he was no better and no worse than the rest of us) which should be our chief concern. We are not to heap adulation upon Cremer but to glorify Christ whom he has so effectively set before us. Cremer's entire life-work; his lexicography, his biblical theology, and his sermons lead us to Christ who is the Truth; and it does so because Cremer himself has been possessed by this Truth. "The Gospel," said Cremer, "consists not in words, in ideas, but it is an action of God with us, when he calls us to Himself through His Word, to His kingdom and His glory."¹

¹ Hermann Cremer, Schriftgedanken, Aphorismen und Skizzen (Guetersloh, 1917), p. 54.

Semantics, Biblical Theology, and Church Proclamation

This writer has endeavored to arrange his material in such a way that he can progressively show how the semantics of biblical language leads naturally into biblical theology and how the content of the biblical theology provides the basis for dogmatics and Church proclamation. All branches of theological work should be like streams which take their rise from the event of God's revelation in Jesus Christ as attested in Scripture and flow together into the main stream of the Church's life and witness. As we have seen, the exegetical, dogmatic, and homiletical elements in Cremer's theology are so interwoven that they constitute a whole. In this he follows the Reformers who did not differentiate sharply between exposition, doctrine,¹ and homily in their writings. Under the influence of Aristotelian thought the Lutheran and Reformed dogmatics of the Post-Reformation period tended to move away from a fresh and living intercourse with Scripture. A theology which does not ever-again renew itself out of Scripture soon becomes sterile and irrelevant. Under the impetus of the scientific movement a new method of biblical study came into being. The advocates of the historico-critical

1 A similar integration of theory and practice may be observed during that period in the Middle Ages when biblical interpretation was at its best. "There is a vital contact between the pulpit and the University chair. . . . These professors are intent to send nourishing food to the body of the faithful, training the chief preachers of the day that they may go and break the bread of the Word to the multitudes. . . . 'The bow is first bent in study, and then in preaching the arrow is let fly.'" [Hugh of St. Cher] . Conrad Pepler, "The Faith of the Middle Ages" in C.W. Dugmore (ed.) The Interpretation of the Bible (London, 1943), pp. 33 f. As the Middle Ages drew toward a close "Aristotle had broken down the identification of theology with exegesis". Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (2nd ed., Oxford, 1952), p. 230. Something similar occurred in the Neo-Scholasticism of the Post-Reformation period.

method of interpretation did not feel at home in the arid atmosphere of Protestant Orthodoxy and so lost sight of their responsibility to interpret the Bible as the Word of God. Thus a rift was made between the historical and the systematic branches of theology. Such thinking is alien to the spirit of the Old and New Testaments. All things are to be brought together in Christ. Theological work can be no exception! Now at last the evangelical churches are beginning to catch sight of a method of interpretation which is both historical and theological. There have always been a few scholars and theologians in the Church who have followed this way. Often their work went unnoticed, or they incurred the scorn and disapproval of their brethren.

1

One such was Hermann Cremer.

1 This observation by Kaehler is apropos here: "Er Cremer blieb mit der kirchlichen Arbeit in allen ihren Zweigen. . . sah er auch die unter seinen Lehrstule sich draengenden Scharen immer darauf an, das ihnen nicht Forscher, sondern Hirten werden sollten . . . dienende Glieder eines nicht erst zu erfindenden und aufzurichtenden Ganzen, das seinen Wurzeln in der Reformation und der Bibel hat. So hat er an seinem Teile dafuer gesorgt, dass in der Kirche und in der Theologie das goettliche Ansehen der Schrift un ihr tieftes reformatorischen Verstaendniss nicht vergessen sei bei der ungewissen Fahrt in eine neue Zeit." Martin Kaehler, "Wie Hermann Cremer wurde?" BFTh, VIII, 1 (1904), pp. 30 f.

CHAPTER IX

THE PLACE OF SEMANTICS IN THEOLOGICAL HERMENEUTICS

A Summary of the Basic Insights

Our inquiry began with an investigation of the language of Scripture, with a survey of Cremer's lexicographical studies of some of the great theological concepts of the Old and New Testaments. Through the labors of Cremer and those who followed him, the lexicography of the biblical languages has been brought into the realm of biblical theology where it belongs. The lexicographical task is no longer left in the hands of a philologist who does not share the faith or the aims of the theologian. The kind of biblical philology envisioned by Cremer is to be no less scientific because it is theological and no less theological because it is scientific. As a philologist Cremer leaves much to be desired; specialists in Old Testament and New Testament studies will not find him satisfying. He set himself a task so enormous that no one man could possibly fulfill it. The philological, critical, and historical aspects of the undertaking have been handled far more adequately by the contributors to Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, but the editors have not seen fit to depart from the original aims which motivated Cremer. The theological world owes Cremer a debt of gratitude because he more than anyone else effected the union between philology and theology upon which Kittel's Woerterbuch is based.

It should be said very emphatically that the inner secret, the dynamic of biblical interpretation, is in no sense Cremer's private possession. The Scripture principle of the Reformation is the common heritage of all the evangelical churches. This writer has been led again and again to consider Cremer's contribution within the broader context of the Church's ongoing task of biblical interpretation, for the subject under discussion is bigger than any scholar or any group of scholars. Three very significant interpretative problems have come into focus in the course of this study. These are: (1) The role of Graeco-Roman culture in the origin and interpretation of the New Testament writings; (2) the question of the proper methodology for biblical theology; (3) the appropriation of the fruits of scholarly research in the ongoing life and witness of the Church. The summary which follows is not an exposition of the views of Cremer. These are the writer's own conclusions in the light of his study of Cremer and of the subject as a whole.

Graeco-Roman Culture and Biblical Interpretation

Early in the history of the Christian Church a synthesis was effected between theology and Greek philosophy. This synthesis is not to be seen in the New Testament itself, but by the time of the Apostolic Fathers¹ it had already occurred. This fusion of Greek thought with biblical thought was not entirely detrimental to the life and growth of the Church. From it we have doctrinal statements like the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. We have a great theological heritage from the Fathers who all partook of the

1 See K.L. Schmidt, "The Church," Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament, trans. J.R. Coates (London: 1950), p.66.

Hellenic spirit to a greater or lesser degree. And yet, because our own modern Western culture is so largely determined by Graeco-Roman culture, biblical scholars are prone to overlook the fact that in the New Testament we have a content and a mode of thought expressed through the Greek language which is essentially that of ancient Israel and of first-century Palestinian Judaism. Only in recent years has theology begun to free itself from some of the negative effects which have been produced by this intercourse between Hellenic culture and the Christian faith.

The message of the New Testament is not stated in the speculative modes of Greek thought but in the very realistic mode of the Old Testament. The content of the kerygma cannot be removed from the decidedly Semitic mold in which it is cast. Christ the risen Lord and Jesus of Nazareth are one and the same. To lose sight of the Jewish historico-theological background of the New Testament would be to cease to understand revelation as historical event. The Apostles declared that the Word of God had indeed become history; it had become flesh. The kerygma is not simply the intermingling of Jewish apocalyptic with Gnostic redemption myth as Bultmann supposes. No distinction can be drawn between redemptive history and one's personal experience of redemption. Redemptive history is genuine history. The once-and-for-all events of the redemptive history are contained in and validated ever-again in our own experience of redemption.

The heated controversy over the so-called myth in the New Testament would not be so urgent nor so heated if it were remembered by all concerned that the New Testament proclamation is rooted in the history of Israel as the

covenant nation and that the history of Jesus of Nazareth is a real part of Israel's history. Here is a hermeneutical fact of first importance which the semantic study of biblical language has yielded for us. This assertion can be verified by looking into Cremer's Woerterbuch, or Schlatter's New Testament commentaries, or almost any major article in Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament (e.g., λόγος, ἄγιος, βασιλεία, σωθήκη, σίκλιος).¹

Hermeneutics as the classical art or science of interpretation has its roots in ancient Greek philosophy. Thus, in the whole course of its development, the art of interpretation has exhibited a Hellenic, humanistic spirit which is extremely uncongenial to the spirit of the New Testament.² The consequences have been far-reaching and sometimes disastrous for biblical interpretation. Traditionally, hermeneutics has been worked out in the form of abstract rules or principles, but the Old and New Testaments have a content which is as specific and concrete as possible. The word of Scripture is self-verifying; it shatters all efforts to reduce it to a set of abstracts rules or universally-valid principles. The modern development from Schleiermacher through Bultmann fares little better. Taking

1 Adolf Schlatter testifies very clearly concerning the role of semantics in biblical hermeneutics; "Da ich durch einen Sprachforscher zum Theologen geworden bin, hatte ich keine Theologie, die die Geschichte vergass, und keine Geschichte, die mir Gott verbarg." Adolf Schlatters Rueckblick auf seine Lebensarbeit, p. 33.

2 Cf. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 31. He recalls the impression which the reading of Homer made upon him: "An ihm erwachte mein Gefuehl fuer die Staerke und die Schwachheit des Griechentums, fuer das in uns wirksame griechische Erbe und fuer den Gegensatz, in dem die christlichen Ziele zu den griechischen Motiven stehen."

their cue from Schleiermacher thinkers like Dilthey, Wach, and Torm abandoned the propositional method and turned to an analysis of the subjective, psychological aspects of the interpretative act. Thus we find Bultmann trying to substitute existential thought-forms for the primitive, "mythological" thought-forms of the New Testament. But in all this the Greek philosophical distinction between idea and event, subject and object has not been overcome - and we find no such distinction in the New Testament. Conservative scholars who are zealous to defend the authority and the infallibility of the Bible against the inroads of "destructive critics" are usually unaware that they are employing an interpretative method which has the same inherent weakness as that of their opponents.¹ They are in imminent danger of binding the Word of God and turning the Gospel into a law.

When we penetrate the words of the New Testament, when we seek their inner meaning, we come to Christ who is not an idea, not a principle, but a Person. Scripture is self-verifying because Christ is the Amen, the true and faithful witness.² Otto Weber has very forcefully pointed out that even the most Christocentric theology can miss the mark if Christ is allowed to become a mere principle rather than a Person. We must have the reality of the inner experience of union with Jesus Christ, crucified, risen, and glorified.³

1 The definitive work in this field for conservative Protestants in the U.S.A. is Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: 1956). Although it contains much useful information, there is an implicit rationalism in it. The author never gets beyond a restatement of neo-scholastic hermeneutics in the Aristotelian mode.

2 Note John 1:18.

3 Otto Weber's remarks about the perils of the Christ-principle as opposed to the Christ-event were made in a lecture on dogmatics which the writer

A Method for Biblical Theology

The observations which we have made about the influence of Greek thought upon biblical hermeneutics are also valid in the realm of biblical theology. We saw how Cremer envisioned biblical theology in terms of a Heilsgeschichte which culminates in the person and work of Christ. He endeavored to prove that the Old Testament concept of justification is in terms of a holy and righteous God who performs mighty acts for the redemption of the elect. The judgment which Israel brings upon herself when she breaks the covenant becomes the means whereby she is restored into fellowship with God. Cremer endeavors to trace this concept of the vindicating, redemptive judgment of God through the whole Scripture until it reaches its culmination point in Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. While Cremer has brought forth many valuable insights by this method, it is evident that the whole sweep of biblical thought cannot be brought to bear so neatly upon this one single concept. It is indeed true that God's act of justification is the same as His act of redemption in Christ, but more is involved in redemption than justification alone. Cremer has been most successful, however, in showing how the Graeco-Roman conception of penal judgment led to a misunderstanding of the biblical meaning of judgment. Here the Hebraic mode prevails and judgment should be understood from the positive rather than the negative side. This is judgment on behalf of one whose faith is his just cause, whose vindication before his judge is sure

attended at the University of Goettingen in the summer semester of 1955. Weber's Christology will be formulated in the forthcoming second volume of his Grundlagen der Dogmatik.

because Another stands in his place to make atonement for him. According to law, condemnation can be the only consequence for the unrighteous, but now a Righteous One is substituted for the unrighteous. Out of God's own sacrifice of love there comes forgiveness and newness of life for the sinner. Indispensable as this knowledge is, it is not the proper medium for conveying the full magnitude and range of biblical theology.

Biblical theology cannot be formulated logically or psychologically; that is, it cannot be stated in the form of dogmatic propositions, nor is it to be ordered according to the stage of development of the religious ideas as they grow from the primitive to the more advanced. Cremer saw this clearly enough, but left us no really workable method by which we can get on with the task of writing a biblical theology. The dynamic integration of the theological and linguistic components which he achieved is an important first step, but it is necessary to go further. The insight for the next step is best supplied by Austin Farrer. Biblical theology as we read it from the pages of Scripture itself is very often in the form of images. Prophetic images from the Old Testament are seen to reappear in the New Testament in new contexts and relationships. The images of prophetic and Apostolic inspiration are the realm of the operation of the Spirit rather than the syntax and accident of New Testament Greek as Cremer was prone to believe. But in this matter of images also, caution is needed, lest we be tempted to think we can capture the mystery of the Spirit as He works upon the Word.

The Word of God often came to the prophets in visual form. Hearing the Word of God was sometimes accompanied by the seeing of visions. There are the visions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah in the Old Testament.

The Book of Revelation in the New Testament consists of a whole series of powerful and majestic visions. In I John 1:1 the apostle appeals to the senses of sight, hearing, and touch as he strives to convey the impact which God's revelation in Jesus Christ has made upon him. Many of the great theological symbols of the Old and New Testaments are in the form of images: the raging waters of the primeval ocean, the divided waters of the Red Sea, the burning bush, the pillar of cloud and of fire, the wilderness, the Jordan, Jerusalem, the temple, the king, the judge, the bridegroom, the shepherd, the vine, the lamb, the son. Always accompanying the images is a history, the history of the covenant with Israel and the history of Jesus of Nazareth. The Word of God is not only visualized, seen from afar by the prophets, it also becomes actualized. Some of the imagery has a decidedly apocalyptic cast to it, but there is no escaping into phantasy or allegory, for we have to do with this history.

The Word and the Spirit: Continuing Results

We have sketched the rough outlines of a theological method which is neither scholastic nor neo-Platonic. The Christ of the New Testament has cosmic proportions. He is the Alpha and Omega; and yet He is also Jesus of Nazareth, son of Abraham after the flesh. The realm of the Holy Spirit is also the realm of the historical Jesus. The Christian does not have mystical experiences which are unrelated to Him. The scholar who would critically and scientifically interpret the New Testament must begin in faith in this Jesus. We have also to speak of biblical theology rather than of Old Testament and New Testament theology. With the help of scholarly research we can re-create

an imaginative picture of the ancient Hebrew man; we can know how he thought and felt. But we cannot live our lives the way he lived his; we cannot stand where he stood. When we encounter primitive elements in the Old Testament, when we read things which strike us as positively immoral we are not scandalized, because we read with constant reference to the redemption which Christ has brought both for the man of the Old Testament and for us. Conversely, if we read the New Testament in isolation from the Old we are not going to understand it.

There are indications that semantics now has an established place among the theological sciences. Semantic studies are finding their way into all sorts of theological writings: bible commentaries, articles in religious journals, college textbooks on religion.¹ It is difficult to determine to what extent Cremer is responsible for this, although it is certain he has had a hand in it. Kittel's Woerterbuch is undoubtedly the primary influence. The theology of Heilsgeschichte has appeared in America, quite independently, it would seem - and yet not without some faint traces of German influence:

It has been said numerous times by now (particularly by John Wick Bowman) that Prophetic Realism is akin to the point of view of Heilsgeschichte. . . . And this is startling because the same emphases have been developed by a number of British and American Biblical theologians without any direct derivation from the German school. . . .

¹ See, for example, Bruce M. Metzger, "The language of the New Testament," The Interpreters Bible (New York and Nashville; 1952), Vol. VII, pp. 43-59. Note also the exegesis of John 1:1-4 in Vol. VIII of the Interpreter's Bible, pp. 473-77. Other representative examples may be found in The Westminster Study Edition of the Holy Bible (Philadelphia: 1948) New Testament introduction, pp. 17-19. See also John A. Hutchison and James Alfred Martin, Ways of Faith (New York: 1956), pp. 213, 233; and William Barclay, A New Testament Word Book (London: 1955).

It would appear, then, that during the last two centuries there has been in Europe, Britain, and America a developing theological position which avoids the extremes of the radical theologies. . . . It is close to the common-core Biblical faith of the un-sung average pastor as he seeks to break the bread of life to a needy congregation, but it has received also a well developed, highly skilled theological exposition

It was Johann C.K. von Hoffmann (1810-1877) of the University of Erlangen who first made famous the idea of a theology of Heilsgeschichte. . . . He had contemporary Biblical scholars who shared in some of his basic ideas, even though from a more conservative viewpoint. Tobias Beck (1804-1874) of Tuebingen and Hermann Cremer (1834-1903) of Greifswald maintained a closer relation between Scripture and revelation and so regarded the Scripture as more thoroughly normative as the story and medium of redemptive history. These men were followed by the systematic theologian Martin Kaehler (1835-1912) and the Biblical theologian Adolf Schlatter (1852-1938).¹

The writer of this dissertation was most interested to find comments like these coming from a seminary professor on the West Coast of the United States! Indeed, there are indications that the churches are discovering their oneness in Christ through biblical theology. These results are due to the contributions of many scholars and pastors who have labored and are laboring to this end.

One final word is needed about the problem of appropriation. There is a strong tendency for us to think of exegesis, biblical theology, and dogmatics as academic disciplines which have to be somehow applied to the practical concerns of everyday life. But are not all forms of theological work a kind of application, an application of the event of our redemption as we have experienced it in Christ? The life of the mind is but one aspect of the whole life. The intellect is being redeemed together with the whole

1 Arnold B. Come, "'Prophetic Realism' Foreshadowed," Prophetic Realism II, 2 (Spring 1957), 1-3. This is a small periodical published by members of the faculty at San Francisco Theological Seminary, California.

man. The life of the Christian as a member of Christ's body, the Church, involves every aspect of his existence: mental, physical, and emotional. He has been born anew by the Spirit into the realm of the mighty acts of God, into the realm of the crucifixion and the resurrection. This event involves his whole self, and theology is part of his total response, the effort of his mind to understand the mystery of the Kingdom of God to which he belongs. He knows himself to be a sinner who lives in a sinful world which stands under the judgment of God; but he knows too, that the course and final outcome of his life are not determined by the sinful flesh, but by the Spirit which is at work within him. All our theological work belongs to the old creation which is passing away, but together with the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, it serves as a sign that we belong to the new creation. "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>BFTh</u>	<u>-Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie</u>
<u>Cremer, ET</u>	<u>-Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek,</u> trans. William Urwick (4th ed., 1892)
<u>Cremer-Koegel</u>	<u>-Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der Neutestament-</u> <u>lichen Graecitaet (10 Aufl., 1915)</u>
<u>PRE</u>	<u>-Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie</u> <u>und Kirche (3. Aufl., 1896-1913)</u>
<u>RGG</u>	<u>-Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (2 Aufl.,</u> <u>1927)</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	<u>-Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>

THE WRITINGS OF HERMANN CREMER

Books and Monographs

- Cremer, Hermann, Die eschatologische Rede Jesu Christi, Matth. 24. 25. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1860.
- _____. Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecitaet. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1. Aufl. 1867, 9. Aufl. 1902. Zehnte, voellig durchgearbeitete und vielfach veraenderte Auflage. Hrsg. von Julius Koegel. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1915.
- _____. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Translated by William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1st ed., 1872, 4th ed., 1892.
- _____. Ueber den Zustand nach dem Tode. Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann. 1. Aufl. 1868, 6. Aufl. 1901.
- _____. Beyond the Grave. Translated by Samuel T. Lowrie. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1886.
- _____. Die kirchliche Trauung, historisch, ethisch, und liturgisch. Ein versuch zu Orientierung. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1875.
- _____. Die Aufgabe und Bedeutung der Predigt in der gegenwaertigen Krisis. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1. Aufl. 1877, 2. Aufl. 1892.
- _____. Die Befaeuhung zum Geistlichen Amt. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1. Aufl. 1878, 2. Aufl. 1900.
- _____. Unterweisung im Christentum nach der Ordnung des kleinen Katechismus. Guetersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1. Aufl. 1883, 2. Aufl. 1899.
- _____. Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhang ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1. Aufl. 1899, 2. Aufl. 1900.
- _____. Die Christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," I, 4. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsman, 1897.
- _____. Weissagung und Wunder im Zusammenhang der Heilsgeschichte. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," IV, 3. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1900.

- _____. Die Grundwahrheiten der christlichen Religion nach
D. R. Seeberg. Ein Bericht. "Beitraege zur Foerderung
christlicher Theologie," VII, 2. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann,
1903.
- _____. Zum Kampf um das Apostolikum. Eine Streitschrift wider
D. Harnack. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben. 1.-2. Aufl. 1892,
3.-7. Aufl. 1893.
- _____. Warum koennen wir das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis
nicht aufgeben? Zweite Streitschrift zum Kampf um das Apostolikum.
Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1893.
- _____. Das Wesen des Christentums. Vorlesungen im Sommer 1901
vor Studierenden aller Fakultaeten an der Universitaet Greifs-
wald gehalten. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann. 1. Aufl. 1901,
3. Aufl. 1902.
- _____. A Reply to Harnack on the Essence of Christianity. Trans-
lated by Bernhard Pick. New York: Funk & Waghalls, 1903.
- _____. Gethsemane. Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der Geschichte
Jesu und unserer Erloesung. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1902.
- _____. Aus dem Nachlass eines Gottesgelehrten. Aufsaeze, Briefe
und Tagebuchblaetter von Dr. Samuel Collenbusch, weiland praktischer
Arzt in Barmen. Mit einer geschichtlich orientierenden Einleitung.
Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1902.

Lectures and Sermons

- _____. Der biblische Begriff der Erbauung. Barmen: Klein, 1863.
- _____. Ueber die Wunder im Zusammenhange der goettlichen Offenbarung.
Barmen: W. Langewiesche's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1865.
- _____. Vernunft, Gewissen und Offenbarung. Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1869.
- _____. Die Auferstehung der Toten. Ein Beitrag zum Schriftverstaend-
nis. Barmen: Klein, 1870.
- _____. Ueber Luthers Stellung zur Judenmission. Barmen: Klein, 1870.
- _____. Der Gott des Alten Bundes. Ein Beitrag zum Schriftverstaend-
nis. Barmen: Klein, 1872.
- _____. Die nationale Aufgabe der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands
in der Gegenwart. Stralsund: Regierungs-Buchdruckerei, 1874.

- _____. Die Bibel im Pfarrhaus und in der Gemeinde. Berlin:
Verlag des Hauptvereins fuer das christliche Erbauungsschriften.
1. Aufl. 1878, 4. Aufl. 1888.
- _____. Reformation und Wissenschaft. Akademische Rede zum 400jaehr.
Gedaechtnis des Geburtstags D. M. Luthers am 10; Nov. 1883.
Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1883.
- _____. Ueber den Einfluss des christlichen Prinzips der Liebe auf
die Rechtsbildung und Gesetzgebung. Rede zur akademischen Feier
des Geburtstags Sr. Majestaet Kaiser Wilhelm II. Berlin: Wiegandt
& Grieben, 1889.
- _____. Die Fortdauer der Geistesgaben in der Kirche. Guetersloh:
C. Bertelsmann, 1890.
- _____. Die Gebetsverheissungen des Herrn und der Zustand unserer
Kirche. Berlin: Buchhandlung der Stadtmission, 1891.
- _____. Wozu verpflichten uns die Gebetsverheissungen des Herrn?
Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1. Aufl. 1891, 2. Aufl. 1899.
- _____. Duell und Ehre. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1894.
- _____. Ueber die praktischen Ziele des christlichen Studenten-
kongresses. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1894.
- _____. Glaube, Schrift und heilige Geschichte. 3 Vortraege.
Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1896.
- _____. Wesen und Wirkung der Taufgnade. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann,
1899.
- _____. Taufe, Wiedergeburt und Kindertaufe in Kraft des Heiligen
geistes. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1. Aufl. 1900, 2. Aufl. 1901.
- _____. Das Wesen der christlichen Gemeinschaft. Dresden: Naumann,
1899.
- _____. Die Bedeutung des Artikels von der Gottheit Christi
fuer die Ethik. Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1901.
- _____. Predigt am Buess- und Bettage. 4. Mai 1887, ueber
1. Kor. 11,31. Greifswald: Abel, 1887.
- _____. Rede am Sarge des im Duell gefallenen stud. theol. H. S.
Gehalten am 8. Juli 1887, ueber Psalm 51, 3-16. Greifswald:
Abel, 1887.
- _____. Predigt zur Eroeffnung der 4. ordentlichen Generalsynode
am 23. Nov. 1897. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1897.

- _____. Pastoraltheologie. Vorlesungen im Wintersemester 1887-88. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf, 1904.
- _____. Das Wort vom Kreuze. Ein Jahrgang Predigten. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1. Aufl. 1891, 2. Aufl. 1900.
- _____. Christus ist mein Leben. Akademische Predigten aus den Jahren 1893-99. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1906.
- _____. Troestet mein Volk! Alttestamentliche Predigten aus dem Jahre 1876-77. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1909.
- _____. Ueber Arbeit und Eigentum nach christlicher Anschauung. Vorlesung. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," XI, 3. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1907.
- _____. Schriftgedanken, Aphorismen und Skizzen. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," XXI, 8. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1917.

Periodical Articles

- _____. "Die Wurzeln des Anselmischen Satisfaktionsbegriffs," Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1880), 7 ff.
- _____. "Der germanische Satisfaktionsbegriff in der Versoehnungslehre," Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1893), 316 ff.
- _____. "Beitraege zu einer christliche Weltanschauung," Beweis des Glaubens, V (1869), 40 ff., 59 ff.
- _____. "Das Reich Gottes, die Loesung der Weltraetsel," Beweis des Glaubens, V (1869), 501 ff.
- _____. "Die Autoritaet der Heiligen Schrift," Beweis des Glaubens X (1874), 313 ff.
- _____. "Die Menschheit Christi im Lichte seiner Gottheit," Beweis des Glaubens, XVII (1881), 245 ff.

Encyclopaedia Articles

- _____. "Prinzipienlehre," Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften, herausgegeben von Otto Zoeckler. Noerdlingen: C. H. Beck, 1884, II, 607-615, 637-660.

_____. "Collenbusch," "Hasenkamp," "Menken," Der Protestantismus am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts in Wort und Bild, herausgegeben von C. Werkshagen, Berlin: Wartburg Verlag, 1902.

_____. The following articles in Realencyklopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche, herausgegeben von Albert Hauck, 3. Aufl., Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896-1913: "Abendmahl" (Schriftlehre), I, 32-38; "Collenbusch," IV, 239 ff.; "Ebenbild Gottes," V, 113-118; "Engel," V, 365 ff.; "Fleisch," VI, 98-105; "Geist, heiliger," VI, 444-450; "Geist des Menschen," VI, 450-457; "Geistesgaben," VI, 460-463; "Gerechtigkeit des Menschen," VI, 473 ff.; "Heiligung," VII, 573-578; "Inspiration," IX, 183-203.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA AND EVALUATIONS OF CREMER'S THEOLOGICAL WORK

Cremer, Ernst. Hermann Cremer, ein Lebens- und Charakterbild. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912.

Haussleiter, Johannes. "Cremer," Realencyklopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3. Aufl., Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896-1913, XXIII, 329 ff.

Kaehler, Martin. Wie Hermann Cremer wurde? Erinnerungen eines Genossen. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," VIII, 1. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904.

Kaehler, Martin; Luetgert, Wilhelm; Schlatter, Adolf; et al. August Hermann Cremer, Gedenkblaetter. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904.

Schlatter, Adolf. Die Entstehung der Beitrage zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie und ihr Zusammenhang mit meiner theologischen Arbeit. "Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie," XXV, 1. Guetersloh. C. Bertelsmann, 1920.

_____. Adolf Schlatters Rueckblick auf seine Lebensarbeit. Zu seinem hundertsten Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Theodor Schlatter. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1952.

Deissmann, Adolf, "Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch" (10. Aufl.), Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXXVII, 17 (17 Aug. 1912), 520 ff.

Fascher, Erich, "Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LVIII, 1 (7 Jan. 1933), 4-8.

Hoskyns, Edwin, "A Theological Lexicon to the New Testament," Theology, XXVI, 152 (Feb. 1933), 82 ff.

- Jordan, H., "Biblisch-theologisches Woerterbuch," Theologisches Literaturblatt, XXXII, 20 (29 Sept. 1911), 465-67.
- Reischle, Max, "Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes," Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXIV, 15 (22 Juli 1899), 443-47.
- Schuerer, E. "Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre," Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXIV, 25 (9 Dec. 1899), 681-82.

COLLATERAL SOURCES

Semantics and lexicography

- Deissmann, Adolf. Bible Studies. Translated by A. Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- _____. Light from the Ancient East. Translated by L. Strachan. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.
- Grimm, Wilibald, "Kritisch geschichtliche Uebersicht der neutestamentlichen Verballexica seit der Reformation," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, III (1875), 479 ff.
- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich, Gerhard (ed.) Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Kittel, Gerhard. Lexicographia Sacra. Two Lectures on the Making of the Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament. "'Theology' Occasional Papers," No. 7. London: S. P. C. K., 1938.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. Sources of New Testament Greek, or the Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I (Prolegomena), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- _____. The Science of Language and the Study of the New Testament. Being the Inaugural Lecture delivered on January 30th 1906. Manchester: The University Press, 1906.
- Moulton, James Hope, and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Illustrated from the Papyri and Non-literary Sources. London, 1914-29.

Preisigke, Friedrich, Woerterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden.
Vollendete von E. Kiessling. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr,
1925-31.

Richardson, Alan (ed.). A Theological Word Book of the Bible. London:
S. C. M. Press, 1950.

Tholuck, August, "Lexicography of the New Testament," translated by
Edward Robinson. Biblical Repository, I (1831).

Zeischwitz, Gerhard von. Profangraecitaet und biblischer Sprachgeist.
Eine Vorlesung ueber die biblische Umbildung hellenischer Begriffe
besonders der psychologischen. Leipzig: 1859.

Hermeneutics

Bartsch, Hans Werner (ed.). Kerygma and Myth. A Theological
Debate. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Barth, Karl. Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag,
1932 - I/2, 509-547, 809-830.

Bengel, Johann Albrecht. Gnomon of the New Testament. Translated
by William Fletcher. Edinburgh: 1858.

Brown, James. Subject and Object in Modern Theology. New York:
The MacMillan Company, 1955.

Brunner, Peter, "Charismatische und Methodische Schriftauslegung nach
Augustins Prolog zu De doctrina christiana," Kerygma und Dogma,
I, 1 (1955), 59 ff.

Bultmann, Rudolf, "Das Problem der Hermeneutik," Zeitschrift fuer
Theologie und Kirche, XLVII, 1 (1950), 47-69.

Coates, J. R. (Translator and editor) Bible Key Words From Gerhard
Kittel's Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
London: Adam and Charles Black. Quell, Gottfried, and Stauffer,
Ethelbert, "Love" (1949); Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, "The Church"
(1950); Quell, Gottfried, et al., "Sin" (1951); Quell, Gottfried,
and Schrenck, Gottlob, "Righteousness" (1951); Bultmann, Rudolf,
"Gnosis" (1952).

Diestel, Ludwig, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen
Kirche. Jena; 1869.

Dilthey, Wilhelm, "Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik," Philosophische
Abhandlungen, Tuebingen, 1900.

- _____. Wilhelm Dilthey's Gesammelte Schriften. II. Bd., Weltbild und Weltanschauung des Menschen in Renaissance und Reformation. Leipzig, 1914.
- Dobschuetz, E. von, "The Bible in the Church," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, J. Hastings, ed. (1908-21), II, 581 ff.
- Dugmore, C. W. (ed.). The Interpretation of the Bible. London: S. P. C. K., 1944.
- Ebeling, Gerhard, "Die Bedeutung der historisch-kritischen Methode fuer die protestantische Theologie und Kirche," Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche, XLVII, 1 (1950).
- Farrar, Frederic W. History of Interpretation. London: MacMillan and Co., 1886.
- Flacius, Matthias (Illyricus). Clavis Scripturae Sacrae. Editio nova. Basel: 1629.
- Fuchs, Ernst. Hermeneutik. Bad Canstatt: R. Muellerschon Verlag, 1954.
- Gennrich, P. Der Kampf um die Schrift in der deutsch-evangelischen Kirche des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Berlin: 1898.
- Heinrich, G., "Hermeneutik," Realencyklopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3. Aufl., Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896-1913, VII, 718 ff.
- Hofmann, J. C. K. von. Biblische Hermeneutik. Noerdlingen: C. H. Beck, 1880.
- Piper, Otto A., "Principles of New Testament Interpretation," Theology Today, III, 2(July 1946), 192.
- Preuss, Robert. The Inspiration of Scripture; a study of the theology of the 17th century Lutheran dogmaticians. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1955.
- Ramm, Bernard. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. A Textbook of Hermeneutics for Conservative Protestants. Revised edition. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1956.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. Leipzig: 1910.
- Reuss, Eduard. History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. Translated by E. L. Houghton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.

- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. Hermeneutik und Kritik. Mit besondere Beziehung auf das Neue Testament. Herausgegeben von Friedrich Luecke (Berlin: 1838).
- Smalley, Beryl. The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages. 2nd ed., Oxford: The University Press, 1952.
- Sparks, H. F. D. The Old Testament in the Christian Church. London, 1944.
- Tholuck, August "The Merits of Calvin as an Interpreter of Holy Scripture," translated by Leonard Woods, Jr., Biblical Repository, II (1832), 541 ff.
- _____. "Hints on the Importance of the Study of the Old Testament," The Biblical Cabinet, II (1833), 191 ff.
- _____. "The Old Testament in the New Testament," in A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, translated by James Hamilton, Edinburgh: 1842, II, 181 ff.
- _____. Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Translated by R. Lundin Brown. Edinburgh: 1860.
- _____. Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Translated by C. P. Krauth. Edinburgh: 1860.
- Torm, Friedrich. Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930.
- Volck, W., "Die biblische Hermeneutik," Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften. Noerdlingen: C. H. Beck, 1884.
- Wach, Joachim. Das Verstehen: Geschichte der hermeneutischen Theorie im 19. Jahrhundert. Leipzig: 1926-33.

Biblical Theology

- Burrows, Millar, "The Discipline Manual of the Judaeen Covenanters," O. T. Studien, VIII (1950), 167. ff.
- _____. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1955.
- Come, Arnold B. "'Prophetic Realism' Foreshadowed," Prophetic Realism, II, 2 (1957), 1-3.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Christ and Time. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. London: S. C. M. Press, 1951.

- Farrer, Austin. The Glass of Vision. London: S. P. C. K., 1948.
- _____. A Rebirth of Images. The Making of St. John's Apocalypse. London: S. P. C. K., 1949.
- Filson, Floyd V. The New Testament Against its Environment. London: S. C. M. Press, 1950.
- Gunkel, Hermann, and Dibelius, Martin, "Biblische Theologie," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Handwoerterbuch fuer Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927, I, 1090 ff.
- Heppe, Heinrich. Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in der Reformierten Kirche. Leiden: 1879.
- Hermann, Karl. Johann Albrecht Bengel. Der Klosterpraezepter von Denkendorf. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1937.
- Hoskyns, Edwin, and Davey, Noel. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber and Faber, 1936.
- _____. The Fourth Gospel. London: Faber and Faber, 1940.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.
- Kaehler, Martin, "Biblische Theologie," Realencyklopaedia fuer Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 3. Aufl., Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896-1913, III, 192 ff.
- Knight, G. A. F., A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, "Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers," No. 1. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953.
- Koehler, Ludwig. Der hebraische Mensch. Tuebingen, 1950.
- Oetinger, F. C., Sammtliche Schriften. Herausgegeben von K. C. E. Ehmann. Stuttgart: 1860.
- Porteous, N. W., "Semantics and Old Testament Theology," Oudtestamentische Studien, VIII (1950), 1-14.
- _____. "The Old Testament and Some Theological Thought-Forms," Scottish Journal of Theology, VII, 2 (June 1854), 153-169.
- Quick, Oliver Chase. The Gospel of Divine Action. London: 1933.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. Geschichte des Pietismus. Bonn, 1880.

Rust, E. C., Nature and Man in Biblical Thought. London, 1953.

Schlatter, Adolf, "Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments und die Dogmatik,"
Beitraege zur Foerderung christlicher Theologie, XXIII, 2 (1909).

Schrenk, Gottlob. Gottesreich und Bund im aelteren Protestantismus, vornehmlich bei Johannes Coccejus. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pietismus und der heilsgeschichtlichen Theologie. Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1923.

Snaith, Norman H. The Distinctive Ideas of the New Testament. London, 1944.

Torrance, T. F. Royal Priesthood. "Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers," No. 3. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1955.

Weber, Otto. Grundlagen der Dogmatik. Neukirchen, 1955.

Wright, G. Ernest. The Old Testament Against its Environment. London: S. C. M. Press, 1950.

_____. God Who Acts. Biblical Theology as Recital. London: S. C. M. Press, 1951.